

20.
Library of
Wellesley



College.

Purchased from

Sweet Fund

No 60487

THE EXPOSITOR
VOL. II.

List of Contributors to Volume II.

- REV. PROFESSOR VERNON BARTLET, D.D.
REV. JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. PROFESSOR HUGH BLACK, M.A.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.
REV. J. LLEWELYN DAVIES, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. H. T. F. DUCKWORTH, D.D., TORONTO
REV. PROFESSOR A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D.
REV. H. G. GREY, M.A., LAHORE
PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D.
J. H. A. HART, M.A.
REV. C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A.
PROFESSOR WILLIAM KNIGHT, LL.D.
REV. PROFESSOR ROBERT MACKINTOSH, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., LITT.D.
REV. D. M. MCINTYRE, M.A.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, M.A., LITT.D.
PROFESSOR SIR WILLIAM RAMSAY, D.C.L., D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. A. SMITH, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES STALKER, D.D.
PRINCIPAL W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.
REV. F. W. ORDE WARD, B.A.
REV. NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SEVENTH SERIES

Volume II

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

MCMVI

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

60487

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.

IN the history of Jerusalem, when we come to the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah it is as if a mist lifted and we were regaining that near view of the City which has been more or less obscured since Baruch's stories of Jeremiah's times, and the Dirges of the desolate Sion. Not only are precise narratives resumed and dated to the month and day—a custom we have found with Jewish writers since Baruch. Documents of state are also offered, and, most valuable of all, we have the memoirs of the principal actors, written in the first person singular: a form of literature to which the only precedents, so far as Jerusalem is concerned, have been Isaiah's account of his vision in the Temple and some passages of his earlier life dictated by Jeremiah to Baruch. These new memoirs, however, not being those of prophets, with whom the spiritual vision always tends to overwhelm the material circumstance and personal detail, provide of the latter a wealth unprecedented in the literature of Jerusalem. Their authors, in explaining their policy and describing their conduct—their conversations, their passions and even their gestures—reveal the characters behind these, and add to the long drama of Jerusalem two of its eight or ten most vivid personalities. To our view of the stage itself the gain is considerable. What Baruch did for the hills of Jerusalem and for the courts of the Palace and Temple, Nehemiah now does, and more, for the full circuit of the City walls. There is, too, an atmosphere through which the voices and the tempers of men rise with a dis-

tinctness we hardly ever again feel about the grey town till Josephus comes upon her with his Romans. We see a wet day in December, with a crowd on the broad place before the Temple, *shivering because of their business, and for the great rain*¹; and again an autumn day when the people fill the same space *and feast and send portions to one another and make great mirth, bringing in from the mountain branches of olive, wild olive, myrtle, palm and thick trees* to build booths, every citizen on the roof of his house and all the pilgrims on the broad places by the Water-gate and the Gate of Ephraim.² Perhaps most vivid of all is the building of the Walls, half the force at work with their swords girt to their sides—as only, a few years ago, I saw the Circassians building their houses from the ruins of Ammân under fear of a Beduin attack—and half behind them under the Wall with spears, bows and habergeons, Nehemiah in the centre and a bugler by his side all the long day *from the rise of the dawn till the stars come out*.³ And besides these crises and festivals the daily life of the people unfolds before us; the country-folk and Tyrian fish-dealers waiting till the gates open of a morning, and bringing in through them the City's food to the markets and the offerings for the Temple; the daily table of the hospitable governor, *one ox a day and six choice sheep, also fowls, and once in ten days store of all wines*⁴; and the discontent of an over-taxed people with their fields mortgaged to the usurer—in fact very much that we wanted to know about Jerusalem and now know, not only for that year or two of Nehemiah's reports but for all the long centuries of the common unchanging life on either side of him.

Yet the whole story is beset with difficulties arising from the composition of its text—difficulties about the sources,

¹ Ezra x. 9.

² Neh. viii.

³ Neh. iv. 15 ff.

⁴ Neh. v. 17 ff.

the chronology and the relations of the two principal actors—all of which are hard and some perhaps insoluble, but with which we must grapple before the Jerusalem of Ezra and Nehemiah becomes certain to us. In this preliminary paper I propose to deal with them alone, leaving the topography and history to another.

In the Hebrew Canon and our own the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah are separated; but they were originally one Book: manifestly the compilation of a writer who worked after the fall of the Persian Empire, and whose style in the summary and connective passages which he contributes very closely resembles that of the compiler of the Book of Chronicles. On this ground, and because Ezra-Nehemiah obviously continues Chronicles, he is to be identified with the Chronicler himself, whose date is about 300 B.C., or more than a century after Ezra and Nehemiah visited Jerusalem.¹ Among the constituents of the Book are a historical summary written not in Hebrew but in Aramaic²; several "state-documents" in the direct form³; and two long fragments of "Memoirs" in which Ezra and Nehemiah respectively speak in the first person singular.⁴ As suddenly as these "memoirs" are introduced, so are they again broken off, but other parts of them appear to form the basis of narratives which continue their story but introduce Ezra and Nehemiah in the third person.⁵ Nor

¹ For the proofs of this, which are obvious and accepted by critics of all schools (cf. even Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Ancient Monuments*, 537), see Driver, *Introd.*, 6th ed., 544 f., and list of phrases characteristic of the Chronicler, 535 ff.; and § 5 of Ryle's *Ezra and Neh.*, *Camb. Bible for Schools*.

² Ezra iv. 8-vi. 18.

³ Ezra i. 2-4; iv. 11-16, 18-22; v. 8-17; vi. 3-12; vii. 12-26, all but the first in Aramaic.

⁴ Ezra vii. 27-ix.; Neh. i.-vii. 5 (6-73a?); xii. 31 (32-36?), 37-40; xiii. 4-31.

⁵ Ezra x.; Neh. vii. 73b; viii.-xii. 30.

(as we shall see) does the compiler observe the regular sequence of events. All these features visible on the surface of Ezra-Nehemiah and complicated by others of a more subtle kind have provoked what is perhaps the most considerable controversy in the past ten years of Old Testament scholarship. Some of this is not very relevant to the story of Jerusalem ; but we have to determine at least the most probable answers to the questions raised by the "Memoirs" and the chronology.

No serious objections have been taken to the "Memoirs" of Nehemiah.¹ Written in classical Hebrew—in the vocabulary there are, of course, some late elements—and with the spirit and directness of an actor in the scenes they describe, these "Memoirs" form one of the most valuable documents in the history and topography of Jerusalem. Scarcely less reliable, but to be used with more discrimination, are the passages that continue the story of Nehemiah but present him in the third person.²

The question of the "Memoirs of Ezra" ³ is much more difficult. They also are written in the first person singular, but objection has been taken to their authenticity ⁴ on the ground that their vocabulary and syntax are those of the compiler himself ; that they contain unhistorical elements ; that the whole story of Ezra's activity is improbable ; that Nehemiah does not mention Ezra ; and that Ezra is un-

¹ See last note but one. Renan characteristically guards himself from a final opinion on their authenticity. *Histoire*, iv. 67, 68.

² Neh. x. (?) and xi.

³ Ezra vii. 27-ix.

⁴ Principally by Renan (1893), *Hist.* iv. 96 ff. ; C. C. Torrey (1896), *The Compos. and Histor. Value of Ezra and Neh.* (*Beihefte z. ZATW.* ii.), in which the Ezra memoirs are subjected to a searching analysis with the conclusion that they are the work of the Chronicler himself ; H. P. Smith (1903), *O. T. Hist.* 390 ff., and Foster Kent (1905), *Israel's Hist. and Biogr. Narratives* (in *The Students' O.T.*), 29-34—these last two following Torrey, Foster Kent more moderately. Cf. also Winckler, *Alt-Orient. Forschungen* and *KATZ*, 294.

known both to the Son of Sirach and the author of Second Maccabees, to whom Nehemiah is the sole champion of Judaism at this period.¹ For these reasons the "Memoirs of Ezra" are held to be the merest fiction, invented by priests of a later age in order to place beside the layman Nehemiah a priestly colleague in the restoration of the Law and the Congregation of Israel. It is even denied that Ezra himself existed, except possibly as an ordinary priest whose name had descended to the generation which made so much of him. As we know from the Apocrypha and from Talmudic literature, Ezra became an attractive centre for legend; according to this argument the legend was already begun by the Chronicler in these "Memoirs." To the theory as a whole two answers suggest themselves at once. So lavish and detailed a story can hardly be conceived as developing except from the real labours of an impressive personality. And against the hypothesis that a later generation of priests, jealous for the history of their order, invented a man learned in the Law as colleague to the layman Nehemiah, may be urged the necessity of the actual appearance of such a man in the conditions in which Nehemiah found himself at Jerusalem. A layman like Nehemiah would hardly have ventured to enforce the religious reforms to which he was obliged after his secular work on the Walls was completed, without some authoritative exposition of the Divine Law of his people. The presence of Ezra by the side of Nehemiah is therefore perfectly natural, if not necessary, to the crisis Nehemiah encountered and overcame.

Turning now to the linguistic evidence which is offered for the theory, one is at first sight very much impressed with a list of words and idioms characteristic of the Chronicler which Dr. C. C. Torrey has gathered from the

¹ Ecclesiasticus xlix. 12 ff. ; 2 Macc. i. 10 ff.

"Memoirs of Ezra"; but a careful examination shows it to be far from sufficient proof that these "Memoirs" are the Chronicler's work. A number of the terms and constructions given by Dr. C. C. Torrey are not the peculiar property of the Chronicler, but are employed as well by other post-exilic writers. Of the others, which (outside of the "Memoirs") do only occur in Chronicles some may owe their presence in the "Memoirs" to the Chronicler's editorial work on the latter; and for the rest the explanation is natural that Ezra belonged to the same school of piety and letters in which the Chronicler worked. Again, while the style of the "Memoirs of Ezra" yields very few phrases peculiar to itself, it borrows from other sources, for example from Deuteronomy, from which the Chronicler in his own work wholly abstains.¹ That contrary to his

¹ These conclusions, except that as to the Deuteronomic influence on Ezra (on which see below), were reached by me from a careful examination of Torrey's lists, in which he gives some forty-four instances in the "Ezra Memoirs" of phrases characteristic of the Chronicler. Of these forty-four, seventeen at least are found in other post-exilic writers. Several others, such, for instance, as the combined propositions and the instances taken from ix. 7 ff. (where the use of the first person singular ceases) may be due to the Chronicler's editorial revision. The remainder of the phrases found otherwise in Chronicles alone are too few to support the theory of the identity of authorship, particularly as their presence in the "Ezra Memoirs" may be explained (as I have said above) by Ezra's being under the same influences, religious and literary, as the Chronicler. I had made this examination of the linguistic evidence before there came into my hand the very instructive treatise of Joh. Geissler, *Die litterarischen Beziehungen der Esramemorien insbes. zur Chronik u. d. hexateuch. Quellschriften*, Chemnitz, 1899. Geissler exhibits and emphasizes the direct influence of Deuteronomy and other older strata of the legislation upon the "Ezra Memoirs"; the small signs of the linguistic influence of P. He shows that the prayers, Ezra ix. 6-15, Neh. ix. 6-37, betray much less affinity to the language of the Chronicler than the narrative passages do; that many of the characteristic expressions of the Chronicler are wanting in the "Memoirs"; and that therefore (as against Torrey) we can affirm on the part both of the prayers and the narrative sections a literary independence of the Chronicler. Geissler adds that the greater affinity of the language imputed to Ezra and Nehemiah to Deuteronomy than to P is to be explained by the fact that P was for the first time introduced by them,

usual style, which is that of the priestly and post-exilic writers, the Chronicler has admitted to his story of Ezra—especially into Ezra's prayer as also into the prayer of Nehemiah—so large a proportion of Deuteronomic phrases is sure evidence that he was compiling older materials rather than writing the whole story (as Dr. Torrey concludes) out of his own mind. And, after all, was this a mind which was likely to produce out of itself so large and so defined a figure as Ezra ? I feel it unnatural to suppose that the wealth of incidents, names and characteristics which the "Memoirs of Ezra" contains was all a pure invention especially by a writer whose methods are so well known to us as the Chronicler ; and in this connexion it may be pointed out that while in Chronicles priests throng everywhere and scribes are little mentioned, the Ezra of the "Memoirs" though a priest is before all a Scribe, and his priesthood is magnified only in passages due to the compiler. If the figure of Ezra had been the entire invention of those later priestly circles to which the Chronicler belonged, it would probably have been a more priestly figure than it is, a close reflection of Jeshua the colleague of Zerubbabel. Nor is the great expedition, which Ezra is said to have led to Jerusalem historically improbable. On the contrary, Nehemiah's removal of the abuses of a century, and his triumph over prejudices and habits of worship, which, as "Malachi" tells us, were nearly universal among the priesthood and laity of Jerusalem, as well as his successful foundation of a compact community which remained true to the stricter Law brought from Babylon and resisted as Judaism before Nehemiah had not been able to do the influences of the surrounding heathen—all these achievements of Nehemiah are best explained

whereas Deuteronomy had been classic and influential for nearly two centuries.

through his reinforcement by just so large a number of Babylonian Jews under just such a leader as Ezra. Finally, the absence of Ezra's name from the list of famous Israelites celebrated by the Son of Sirach is certainly striking, but it may have been easily due to some other cause than that writer's ignorance of or disbelief in him, and in any case it cannot outweigh the considerations we have just adduced.

With some supporters of the theory it would seem to be an argument in its favour that the writing of "Memoirs" was so new a form of literature in Israel that it is unlikely two original instances of it should now spring up together.¹ But this form (as we have seen) had precedents among the pre-exilic prophets; and though these are fragmentary and mere circumstance and personal detail are overwhelmed in them by the prophet's wealth of vision, there is enough of the former to afford a model and incentive to men like Nehemiah and Ezra, who not being men with visions to communicate would naturally develop the circumstantial and personal elements in this kind of literature. As for Ezra himself he had in the school to which his own mind was most akin a very near model of this sort. The priest Ezekiel is of all the prophets the one who brings the story of his visions most into the "Memoir" form. To speak then of Ezra's and Nehemiah's Memoirs as without precedent among the Jews is not correct.

Thus the objections to the authenticity of the Memoirs of Ezra are insufficient. But when we try to date himself and his work, especially in relation to the visits of Nehemiah to Jerusalem, we encounter difficulties not so easily removed. The compiler of Ezra-Nehemiah, while furnishing some unquestionable dates, has left the chronology of his Book confused and ambiguous, as the following review of

¹ Torrey, 28 f.; founding on a quotation from Wellhausen.

the data will show. Starting with Ezra iv.—vi. we have first *the building of the Temple* under Cyrus and Darius, 536–485, with the opposition to it of the people of the land, iv. 1–5, then a long account in Aramaic of intrigues from the same quarter against *the building of the Walls* of the City under Xerxes (Ahasuerus, 485–464) and Artaxerxes (464–424)¹; and then we are suddenly brought back to the work on the Temple,² resumed in the second year of Darius (520) and completed on his sixth (516); but this is ascribed to the decrees not only of Cyrus and Darius, but of Artaxerxes,³ and after the celebration of the Passover on the completion of the Temple—*after these things*⁴—comes the expedition of Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (458). Here the dilemma is inevitable. Either the order of events in the text is correct chronologically and the names Xerxes and Artaxerxes are wrongly given to Persian kings before Darius⁵; or else the compiler, unaware of the true succession of events or careless to observe it, has placed the account of the Samaritan opposition *to the Walls*, which prevailed under Xerxes and Artaxerxes, in the middle of his history of *the building of the Temple* under Darius.⁶

Again, the story of Ezra's activity in Jerusalem, Ezra vii.–x., breaks off with the first month of the eighth year of Artaxerxes,⁷ or April, 457, and thereupon Nehemiah's Memoirs begin with the twentieth year of Artaxerxes,⁸ or 445, and proceed, Nehemiah i. vii–73*a*, up to the completion

¹ iv. 6–23 (6, 7 in Hebrew).

² iv. 24–vi. 18.

³ vi. 14.

⁴ vii. 1.

⁵ Some have tried in vain to explain these names as titles of Cambyses and the Pseudo-Smerdis whom Darius overthrew.

⁶ This is now the generally received opinion, but, as we shall see, some refer the account, Ezra iv. 6–23, to the *defeated* Samaritan opposition to the Walls under Nehemiah in 445–4, others read it of an earlier and *successful* opposition by the Samaritans between 457 and 444.

⁷ Ezra x. 16, 17 ff. (compared with vii. 7, 8, 9 and x. 9).

⁸ Neh. ii. 1 gives the date. i. 1 is due to the compiler and uncertain; it cannot, as יקני shows, be the beginning of Nehemiah's Memoirs.

of the building of the Walls (after fifty-two days' work) in the month Elul, the sixth, or September of apparently the year 444¹; but Nehemiah also states, incidentally, that his governorship of the City lasted from the twentieth to the thirty-second of Artaxerxes, or from 445 to 433. Nehemiah's Memoirs break off with vii. 73a,² and the story of Ezra which we left at the end of Ezra x. is resumed, Nehemiah vii. 73b, viii., ix.,³ with the account of his introduction of the Law, its public reading, the Feast of Tabernacles and the National Covenant. These events are dated *in the seventh month*.⁴ Of what year? As the Book stands this seventh month belongs to the last year mentioned by Nehemiah, 444,⁵ and this, no doubt, was the compiler's meaning⁶; yet since we are no longer in Nehemiah's Memoirs, but in a section which seems founded rather on Ezra's, the *seventh month* will in that case refer to the last year Ezra has mentioned, viz., 457.⁷ Nehemiah is mentioned in this section only once, viii. 9, and there not certainly.⁸ Is his name then a later insertion? If so, the passage is cleared of all difficulties in the way of ascribing it to 457; but at least the compiler obviously means Nehemiah to be there. Between chapters ix. and x. the connexion is

¹ vi. 15.

² In our Revised Version this verse is rightly divided between the two sections.

³ The Greek Ezra or 1 Esdras, it is significant, immediately connects these two sections of narrative founded on the Ezra Memoirs. Thus Ezra x. and Neh. viii. form together 1 Esdras ix.

⁴ vii. 73b; viii. 2, 13, 18; ix. 1.

⁵ vi. 15.

⁶ So Ryle.

⁷ Ezra x. 16 compared with vii. 6. That Neh. vii. 73b-ix. is based on Ezra's Memoirs has been fully shown, especially by Geissler and Bertholet.

⁸ The text of Neh. viii. 9 is uncertain; *Nehemiah*, he the *Tirshatha*. The LXX. omits *Tirshatha*, the Greek parallel Esdras A ix. 49, omits *Nehemiah* and takes *Tirshatha* as a proper name. Schlatter (*Zur Topogr. u. Gesch. Paläst.* 407) elides *Nehemiah*, Stade (*Gesch.* ii. 177) and others elide *Tirshatha*, Meyer elides both. See, too, Bertholet *in loco*.

difficult.¹ Are the words in ix. 38—*In all this we are (or were) making a sure covenant and writing it, and upon the seal (or sealed) our princes, our Levites and our priests*—the conclusion of the foregoing prayer as our English versions take them? Or are they the opening, as the Hebrew takes them,² of the narrative in chapter x. in which the writer uses the pronoun *we*—the first instance of this form in narrative³—and speaks of Nehemiah in the third person? Chapter x. has been very variously assigned; some declare it inseparable from ix. and therefore based on the Ezra Memoirs⁴; others hold that there is no connexion between the two, except by the Chronicler's compilation, and, pointing to the absence of all mention of Ezra, assign the substance of it to the Memoirs of Nehemiah.⁵ May it not be from another source—the use of the *we*, unique in the narratives in which Ezra or Nehemiah appears in the third person, points to this—by an eye-witness and parallel to the Memoirs of Nehemiah, for some of the reforms it treats of are the same as he describes in chapter xiii.? Chapter xi., describing measures to increase the population of the City, takes us back to a subject which Nehemiah himself had declared to be pressing just after he had finished the Walls,⁶ and as on that occasion so here are lists of persons, which are continued into chapter xii. With xii. 31 the direct form of Nehemiah's Memoirs is resumed,⁷ after a little intro-

¹ The Hebrew begins ch. x. with what is the last verse of ch. ix. in E.V.

² ix. 38 English = x. 1 Hebrew.

³ Previous instances are confined to the prayers and to Nehemiah's Memoirs, where he appears in the first person and uses "we" of himself and others.

⁴ Kusters, Wellhausen. Foster Kent and others who deny the independence of the Ezra Memoirs assign it of course to the Chronicler.

⁵ Bertholet. His reasons are strong, but if ch. x. be Nehemiah's it breaks curiously the close connexion between his Memoirs in ch. vii. and ch. xi.

⁶ Neh. vii. 4.

⁷ For some of their text the compiler is evidently responsible.

duction by the compiler (27–30). Nehemiah describes the Dedication of the Walls but gives no date, though it is natural to conclude that the Walls were dedicated at no long time after they were finished in 444 ; and this is another reason in addition to the one just given for supposing that the substance of chapter xi., evidently based on Nehemiah's Memoirs, originally followed on vii. 4. Then we are told that *on that day*¹—or as the English versions translate,² *at that time*—that is of the Dedication of the Walls, appointments were made to certain Temple offices, and it was publicly read in the Book of Moses that the Ammonite and Moabite should not enter the congregation of God. Then with the words *before this*² we come to an account by Nehemiah himself of how Eliashib the priest had given Tobiah the Ammonite a chamber in the Temple formerly used for offerings, and Nehemiah adds : *In all this I was not at Jerusalem : for in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes king of Babylon I had come to the king, and at the end of some days I asked leave of the king, and I came to Jerusalem and got intelligence of the evil which Eliashib committed for the sake of Tobiah.*³ He cast Tobiah's goods out of the chamber, restored this to its sacred purpose, and reformed other abuses—all *in those days*.⁴ Taking these connective dates, and especially the words *before this*, we find that according to the Chronicler Eliashib's grant of a chamber to Tobiah, and consequently Nehemiah's absence from Jerusalem between his two visits, took place *before* the Dedication of the Walls. But that this was what Nehemiah's own Memoirs affirmed may well be doubted : it would mean that the Dedication Service was not performed till Nehemiah's second visit, or twelve years after the Walls were finished—a very improbable thing. We have seen above how in the original

¹ xii. 44 ; xiii. 1.² xiii. 4.³ xiii. 6.⁴ xiii. 15, 23.

form of his Memoirs the account of the Dedication Service followed immediately upon that of the building of the Walls.

From this review of the compiler's arrangement of his materials it is clear that he was ignorant of, or indifferent to, the proper chronological order of events before the story of Ezra and Nehemiah commences. That creates a presumption against his chronology during their careers in Jerusalem : and the presumption is confirmed by the facts. He has broken up and rearranged his materials ; some of his dates and connexions are vague and capable of different interpretations ; and in two cases at least he has widely separated passages which appear to belong to each other. He has introduced the long accounts of the introduction of the Law and the Feast of Tabernacles (from Ezra) and of the Covenant (from Nehemiah ?) between two narratives of Nehemiah that are closely connected by their common subject : anxiety for the increase of the population of Jerusalem ¹ ; and he has separated the Dedication of the Walls from their completion by twelve years. It will, therefore, be easily understood how it has been possible for great differences of opinion to arise among scholars as to what was the exact sequence of events in Jerusalem during the period. The expedition of Ezra to Jerusalem with a great company of Babylonian Jews, and the two visits of Nehemiah, the first in which he built the Walls and the second in which he reformed some abuses, are regarded as certain ² ; as also are the dates of these two visits, 445-4 and 433-2 ; the twentieth and thirty-second years of Artaxerxes. But of all else there is question, and chiefly of the date of Ezra's expedition. Did Ezra and his company arrive in Jerusalem, as the Chronicler asserts, some years

¹ Neh. vii. 4 and xi.

² Except, of course, that some, as we have seen, deny Ezra's expedition altogether.

before Nehemiah's first visit and the rebuilding of the Walls ; or did Ezra not appear till the interval between the first and second visits, or not even till the second visit ?

Those who maintain that Ezra came before Nehemiah accept the statements that he arrived in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, 458, and attempted his reforms up to April 457,¹ as belonging to or based on his own Memoirs. What happened then between 457 and Nehemiah's arrival in 445 ? They hold that to these years we must refer the description of attempts to rebuild the Walls and of the successful opposition under Artaxerxes, which (as we have seen) the Chronicler has wrongly placed in the years before the Temple was really begun.² They maintain that the attempt to build the Walls being frustrated and the few repairs which the Jews had succeeded in making upon them being torn down, it was the news of this *fresh* disaster which reached Nehemiah³ by his brother Hanani and moved him to ask leave from Artaxerxes to fortify the City.⁴ It is not necessary to this theory to hold that Ezra himself was concerned in the frustrated attempt to build the Walls—he is not mentioned in the account of it, nor was the rebuilding part of his commission—but some think it a natural step for him to take when he found that in the unprotected state of Jerusalem he was unable to separate between the Jews and the people of the land. Such is the theory which, accepting the dates in Ezra's Memoirs, places his visit to Jerusalem before Nehemiah's. It is a natural one in itself. It is supported, *except in so far as Ezra's share in the*

¹ Ezra vii. 8 ; x. 16 f.

² Ezra iv. 8–vi.

³ Neh. i. 3.

⁴ So Stade, *Gesch.* ii. 141, 152 ff. ; A. B. Davidson, *The Exile and the Restoration*, 96 f. ; Ryle, *Ezr. Neh.* x. 1 ff. ; Wellhausen, *Gesch.* 128 f. ; cf. Driver, *Introd.* 2nd ed., 548 ; Robertson Smith, *O. T. in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed., 226, 445, and the three recent English histories of Israel, by Ottley, Wade (both 1901) and Burnside (1904).

building is concerned, by Nehemiah's account of the effect upon him of Hanani's reports, for Nehemiah's consternation is at least less explicable if those reports were merely of the breached condition in which the Walls had lain since Nebuchadrezzar's overthrow of the City, than if they were the news of a recent disaster. And the theory is not inconsistent with the little we know of the general history of the period. Persia was at war with Greece from 499 to 449, busied with a revolt in Egypt about 460 and with another by Megabyzus the Syrian Satrap in 448-7. In the early years of his reign, therefore, Artaxerxes had reasons for delaying his permission to fortify Jerusalem—the Aramaic document expressly says his decision was not final¹—but after he had come to terms with Megabyzus about 447 he was free to grant the permission which Nehemiah obtained in 445. Artaxerxes is represented as “not a bad but a very weak man governed by courtiers and women.”²

The opposite theory, recently developed by a number of scholars,³ is that Ezra's expedition did not arrive in Jeru-

¹ Ezra iv. 21 : *this city be not builded until commandment be given by me.*

² Tiele, *Enc. Bibl.*, 3674.

³ Kosters (*Die Wiederherstellung Israels*, Germ. by Basedow ; also *Enc. Bibl.* 3386) was the real author of this theory. He takes as “natural the conjecture that Nehemiah's journey to the Court [i.e. in 432] on which he got the title of Tirshatha instead of Peha was the occasion of the return of Ezra and his band of exiles to Jerusalem.” So practically Guthe, *Gesch.* 278. Cheyne, *Jewish Relig. Life after the Exile*, ch. ii., Bertholet (in his commentary) and others place Ezra's arrival in the interval between Nehemiah's two visits, Cheyne reading twenty-seventh for seventh year of Artaxerxes (Ezra vii. 7), i.e. 458 (*Enc. Bibl.* 1474 n. 1). And Wellhausen admits that if Nehemiah's visits did not immediately follow on each other there is room for the possibility of putting Ezra's between. Van Hoonacker, *Néhémie et Esdras*, accepting Nehemiah's report of Ezra's appearance at the Dedication of the Walls and Ezra's own date of his expedition in the *seventh year of Artaxerxes*, understands by the latter Artaxerxes II. Thus Ezra having first been at Jerusalem as a young man in 444 came back with his great band an old man in 398. Kuenen and others (e.g. Meyer) have shown this to be too late a date for Ezra ; and their arguments hold good against Lagrange's theory (quoted by Guthe) that Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes II., 385, and that he and Ezra worked together from the seventh of Artaxerxes III., 351, onwards.

salem till some years after Nehemiah had come and had rebuilt the Walls; that before Nehemiah there had been no effort to repair the ruins left by Nebuchadrezzar, and in consequence no fresh disaster, so far as the Walls were concerned. For this theory it is maintained that the novel element in Hanani's reports from Jerusalem was the *affliction and reproach* which the orthodox Jews were suffering from at the hands of the heathen; and it is alleged that neither Ezra nor any of the persons who returned with him from Babylon, unless it be the family Parosh, is mentioned by Nehemiah among those who helped him with the reconstruction, that in fact Nehemiah found no Babylonian element in the population worth reckoning with. Even the inclusion of Ezra's name in the account of the Dedication of the Walls is said to be due to the Chronicler.¹ It is also urged that the reforms which Nehemiah reports he accomplished² are not intelligible if Ezra had previously been at work.³ On these grounds some postpone Ezra's arrival to the interval between Nehemiah's two visits, and others to the second of these. To suit these alternatives it is proposed to change *the seventh year of Artaxerxes* to which Ezra assigns his expedition to either the *twenty-seventh* or the *thirty-seventh*.⁴

Between the rival theories, I believe that it is impossible to decide upon the evidence at our disposal. The first of them, as I have shown, is consistent and probable, and true to the dates given in Ezra's own Memoirs, the text of which there is no reason to suspect. But it is entirely unsupported by anything in Nehemiah's Memoirs. In his account of the news he received from Jerusalem, of his arrival there

¹ Neh. xii. 36. So Ryssel, Siegfried and Bertholet.

² xiii. 4 ff.

³ Ezra ix. f.; Neh. viii.-x.

⁴ Ezra vii. 8.

and his rebuilding of the Walls, Nehemiah says absolutely nothing of Ezra or his work—which is very strange if Ezra and his great company were already in Jerusalem by 458—and practically nothing which implies them; except (as has not yet been pointed out) the fact that Nehemiah, a Babylonian Jew, had a *brother* or a *kinsman* Hanani, who had been to Jerusalem, is evidence that some Babylonian Jews had travelled there within recent years, and might be considered as a slight indication of Ezra's expedition. Otherwise not a trace of Ezra and his company is given by Nehemiah in this part of his "Memoirs." But this opens up the whole question of the relations of the two of them, for *neither* of them more than mentions the other, and that is a question for which we are wholly without an answer. Had we their full memoirs we might find that their relations were close, or if not, the reason why. But we have not. We simply do not know what Ezra's and Nehemiah's connexion with each other was, and without this knowledge we can hardly hope to solve the problems which the compiler of their Memoirs has left to us.

The other and different question whether, apart from Ezra altogether, the Memoirs of Nehemiah betray evidence of attempts to build the Walls by the Jews and their disappointment by the Samaritans prior to Nehemiah's arrival is also a difficult one. On this the language of Nehemiah, whether in his account of the news brought him or in his prayer or in his petition to the king, is alike ambiguous. The one apparently definite item in it, so far as I can see, is that the gates of Jerusalem had been burned. That can hardly refer to a recent disaster, for even if the Jews had shortly before 445 begun upon the Walls, none of the evidence for this implies that they had got so far with the work as to make it worth while putting in the gates. Here Hanani must be speaking of what had happened after

Nebuchadrezzar's siege. But the rest of his news may be read as of something recent. As for Nehemiah's dismay, it is equally explicable by his having received the news of fresh disaster as by his realizing for the first time, through the mouth of a brother, what the long defenceless state of Jerusalem actually was. Only one thing is clear, that it is impossible to read the Aramaic account of the harassing opposition of the Samaritans to the building of the Walls as if this referred to the threats from Tobiah and others which troubled Nehemiah in his reconstruction. There is no confirmation of this in Nehemiah's own Memoirs. To break these up as has been done¹ at vi. 19 and to insert the Aramaic document there, and then, immediately after Artaxerxes' letter forbidding the building, to continue Nehemiah's Memoirs with the statement by this loyal servant and friend of the king that the Wall was built, is obviously wrong. The Aramaic document, if genuine, refers to events *before* the arrival of Nehemiah.

But though the chronology of the period and the relations of its two principal actors must remain ambiguous its main events, so critical in the history of Jerusalem and its personalities, are certain. Sufficiently clear also are the contributions which Nehemiah makes to the topography of Jerusalem. To all these we shall proceed in another paper.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Foster Kent, *Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives*, 358.

*DR. ORR ON THE PROBLEM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.*¹

THAT this work well deserves the valuable prize which has been awarded it will probably be denied by few readers. The desirability may indeed be questioned of bequests endowing the maintenance of particular opinions; for when the world outgrows those opinions, the persistence of the endowment occasions inconvenience. And that the world outgrows most opinions is evidenced by the attitude now assumed towards the doctrine of the indestructibility of matter and even the definitions of Euclid. Supposing, however, that such endowment is desirable, it has in this case been well bestowed. The author has undertaken to defend a difficult position, all but universally abandoned, and he has defended it. Among apologetic works his will take one of the foremost places for tone and temper, as well as for learning and persuasiveness. Without in any case employing harsh or disagreeable language, he has succeeded in convicting the most careful scholars of inaccuracies, and finding weak points in the most plausible hypotheses. Like a skilful general, he has not undertaken the defence of any fortress that is quite beyond saving, though even in such cases he has a word of comfort for the despairing garrisons: but there is no doubt that for many minds he has provided grounds sufficient to justify them in maintaining conservative opinions, and in holding the attacks on the Biblical narratives to be "mere clouds that will vanish away."

Where so much is concentrated in a single volume, it is not quite easy to select material for special consideration. The points on which comment will be made in this article

¹ *The Problem of the Old Testament*, by J. Orr, D.D. Nisbet. 1906.

are, therefore, quite likely to be inferior in importance to others that might have been chosen.

In the first place, this book hits moderate opinions far harder than it hits extreme opinions. There are whole pages of which the force is confessedly lost if the reader should happen to disbelieve in the Exodus and the Restoration under Cyrus : whereas, if he accept those facts as historical, they will show him reasons for adopting a conservative attitude on some other matters. Perhaps, therefore, rather more space should have been devoted to demonstrating the historical character of Moses, and to dealing with the difficulties that have recently been brought to light in connexion with the narratives of Ezra and Nehemiah. For though some might think that the denial of the existence of Moses and Ezra was a *reductio ad absurdum* of the systems which required it, not every one will regard it in that light. Dr. Orr appears to urge in favour of the existence of Moses the fact that by the concessions of various scholars, the beginnings of Hebrew tradition can be brought within measurable distance from his time : and that with regard to such an event as the Exodus the national consciousness could not be mistaken. On certain matters, such as the Norman Conquest, the American War of Independence, etc., popular tradition could not go wrong. To this Winekler replies that deliberate fictions can, at times, acquire the circulation which renders them equivalent to a national tradition ; and though he gives no examples, perhaps the connexion of Rome with Troy was in his mind. Moreover, the distance between Moses and the date conceded by the critics quoted for the beginnings of tradition seems to amount to 350 years, an interval that should not be underrated.

So long, then, as Egyptian and other monuments are silent, the existence of Moses cannot be demonstrated.

The point that seems most strongly in its favour is the story of his exposure and adoption by Pharaoh's daughter. For either that story is true or false. If it be true, no more need be said. If it be false, it has the character of stories that attach to Alexander the Great and other heroes, who by some similar expedient are made out to belong to nations with which they had no connexion, but which are anxious to claim them. Thus Alexander in one legend is made out to have been an Egyptian, in another a connexion of the Persian king. The purpose of these fictions is to soothe the wounded vanity of the nations whom he conquered. Similarly the story of the rescue of Moses from the Nile, if it be not historical, has the appearance of being an expedient to prove that a man who was ordinarily supposed to be an Egyptian was really an Israelite ; and since relationship is constituted by blood and milk, the legend has been so constructed as to take both these matters into account. But would such a legend be invented except about a historical personage ? It is difficult to find a reason for thinking so ; for a *myth* that made the Israelites owe their national existence to the labours of an Egyptian would be too singular. Hence it appears that before critics found reasons for doubting the historical character of Moses some of them inferred from the account of his birth in Exodus that he was actually an Egyptian. Certainly, the utmost that can be deduced from this argument is that he was a historical personage, and did some important service to the Israelites ; but this, under present circumstances, is not a little.

The second chapter on "The Old Testament from its own Point of View," has, besides the good qualities that have been mentioned, a sort of devotional earnestness that will be respected by all readers, and especially pleasing to those who are in the habit of using the Old Testament

for homiletic purposes. With the saying of Ibn Arabi "no man has ever worshipped anything save God," the matter of this chapter is not in agreement. The author insists on the unique character of the Biblical doctrine, as the sole source of monotheism, as "unfolding in successive stages God's gracious counsel for man's salvation," as indissolubly blending morality and religion. The difficulties which attend these propositions are answered in a discussion towards the end of the volume on the progressive character of revelation, which is one of the best statements of this topic of apologetics. It would be too much to say that any of the objections which can properly be raised against this formula have been silenced; still the lucid explanation of it that has been given should be useful to preachers.

In this portion of the work, too, one is struck by the fact that it bears more hardly on moderate than on radical critics. The author informs us that on first reading Wellhausen's *History of Israel* the rationalizing which predominates therein only brought out more strongly, to his mind, the miraculous elements which the German critic *euhemerizes*—the passage of the Red Sea, the destruction of Sennacherib's forces, the prophecy by Amos of the deportation of the northern kingdom. What if any one goes beyond Wellhausen? The "critical" solution of the imperfect morality of the Old Testament is shown to be inadequate thus: "We may relieve the earlier history of laws and commands of God which offend us; but it is only to roll the burden upon the shoulders of prophets in an age when the higher morality was supposed to be developed." Here too, it is easy to imagine a style of reader whom the reasoning will not affect.

The chapters devoted to the religious development of Israel and the criticism of the Pentateuch contain much

that deserves careful consideration. Apart from their controversial value they are of great use as giving a succinct and accurate account of the chief stages of the Pentateuch question, and of the contributions of various scholars to its solution. The author, in dealing with Deuteronomy, gives reasons for thinking that Hilkiah's was a real, not a fictitious discovery, and endeavours to show that the contents of the book are more suited to their traditional date than to that of Josiah; and further that they presume acquaintance with matter found in the "Priestly Code," which is now ordinarily regarded as later. The following is a good example of the close and incisive character of his reasoning (p. 301) :

Let us accept, as we are glad to do, the statement that the main stock of the legislation of P is based on pre-existing Temple usage, and see what follows. The observance of this main stock before the Exile either appears in the history or it does not. If it does not, what becomes of the argument from silence against the other institutions? If it does, what becomes of Wellhausen's statement that no trace can be found of acquaintance with the Priestly Code, but on the other hand very clear indications of ignorance of its contents? It is nothing to the purpose to reply, as is commonly done, that before the Exile there was indeed praxis—usage—but no written Priestly Code, or Code of ritual law attributed to Moses. For (1) the very ground on which the existence of a written code is denied is that there is no proof of the practice; and (2) if the practice is allowed, who is to certify that a written law, regulating the practice, was not there?

It seems questionable whether the whole of this defence of the Mosaic character of the Pentateuch is not vitiated by a single concession, viz., that the book, professedly discovered by Hilkiah, which called forth the reformation of Josiah, "embraced, if it did not entirely consist of, the Book of Deuteronomy." In the note on this sentence (p. 357) there is the explanation that "the narrative in Kings generally does not require, though at points it suggests, more"; and in the discussions concluded on page 284 it is suggested

that Deuteronomy having circulated as a separate book, it was a separate authentic copy which was deposited in the Temple and there found by Hilkiah. (What is meant by an authentic copy is far from clear.) Now supposing it to be granted that the Book of Deuteronomy was what Hilkiah found in the Temple, how is the appearance of the other books of the Law to be explained? There is no record of a further discovery: criticism therefore supposes them to have been *invented*. Unless we borrow a suggestion from the Koran, viz., that the same book may be repeatedly revealed to different persons, it is difficult to think of another alternative. For there appear to have been no *living* MSS. of the Law—persons on whose memory it was faithfully impressed—else the discovery of a copy would have been a matter of little importance. At most its consequence would have lain in its being the autograph of Moses, as the Chronicler seems to suggest.

The account that is given of the origin of the Pentateuch (p. 369) does not seem to deal with this particular question: it is worth quoting, as showing how near conservative views come in these days to radical views:

Our conclusion is not that Moses himself wrote the Pentateuch in the precise shape or extent in which we now possess it; for the work, we think, shows very evident signs of different pens and styles, of editorial redaction, of stages of compilation. . . . In the collation and preparation of the materials for this work—some of them, perhaps, reaching back into pre-Mosaic times—and the laying of the foundations of the existing narratives, to which Moses lent the initial impulse, many hands and minds may have co-operated, and may have continued to co-operate after the master mind was removed; but unity of purpose and will gave a corresponding unity to the product of their labours.

It is very noteworthy that in this account Moses comes not at the *end* of the compilation, in which case it would all be commended by his authority, but somewhere near the beginning; it is not easy, therefore, to see how this

theory, except in the matter of date, differs from that of "irresponsible redactors, combining, altering, manipulating, enlarging at pleasure," with which it is contrasted on page 375. We are still confronted with the question of what the Moslems call the *isnād*; for they, in order to secure themselves against forgeries, devised the plan of requiring for every book, and indeed every saying, a series of authorities in an unbroken chain from the author of the book or saying to the last person who adduces it. The nearest thing to an *isnād* that Dr. Orr produces is to be found on page 370, where five firm strands of tradition are mentioned, viz., the fact that all the codes profess to come from Moses, that King Josiah and the people of his day accepted Deuteronomy as a genuine work of Moses, that the Jewish people of Ezra's time accepted the whole Pentateuch as Mosaic, that the Samaritans received the Pentateuch from the Jews as undoubtedly Mosaic, and that the J E history is implied by both Deuteronomy and P. Now this *isnād* has evidently the weakness which the critics find in it: if it is important to prove that P is earlier than Deuteronomy, an *isnād* should be found for it that is earlier than the *isnād* for Deuteronomy. And indeed, with the opinion of the Jews of Ezra's time, who could not understand the Law without a translation, and that of the Samaritans, who were probably in the same case, we do not concern ourselves. The important thing is surely that the book of the Law first discovered was Deuteronomy, and that in circumstances which imply the absence of the other books.

To the *isnād* for Deuteronomy, i.e. Josiah from Hilkiyah, some space is devoted by Dr. Orr, to whom the question naturally suggests itself—On what grounds was the genuineness of the book assumed by Josiah and his contemporaries? His answer is as follows: "Is it not apparent that though the Book of the Law had long been neglected, disobeyed,

and allowed to become practically a dead letter, men still knew of the existence of such a book, and had sufficient idea of its contents to be able to recognize it when this old Temple copy was suddenly brought to light ? ” The reasoning here seems to fall far below a paragraph quoted above in incisiveness and brilliancy. If people knew of the existence of the book and enough of its contents to be able to identify it, Hilkiah’s claim to have *discovered* it collapses ; we might, any of us, as well claim to have discovered the Statutes at Large when we go to the Museum to consult them. All that can be granted is that a tradition of a Mosaic code may have been current : the identity of that code with the book discovered by Hilkiah is made to depend, in the first place, on the critical ability of Josiah’s contemporaries—which Dr. Orr rates fairly high. “ If high priest, scribe, king, prophetess, were misled into thinking that they were dealing with an old Mosaic book, when the parchment in their hands was one on which the ink was scarcely dry, they must have been simpletons to a degree without parallel in history ” (p. 258) This statement is surely hyperbolic. The person whom it was important to convince was the king : if he were convinced, the sceptical would not have done wisely in expressing their doubts. The Bible regularly makes the king responsible for the religion of the country ; and the history of England under Mary I. and Elizabeth makes it certain that this view is correct, even where the royal power is less absolute than it was in Judaea. Hence from the fact that no scepticism is recorded we cannot infer that none was felt when the discovery was made known. Even, however, if there were no doubts, we ought not to demand of the contemporaries of Josiah the skill in dating documents, which is the result of centuries of grammatical and palaeographical study.

In dealing with both Deuteronomy and the code sup-

posed to have been produced by Ezra a good deal is said of the harshness of attributing to the authors of the codes so immoral an act as fabrication. "It is not overstepping the mark to say that men like Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Ezra were as capable of distinguishing between truth and falsehood, as conscious of the sin of deceit, as zealous for the honour of God, as incapable of employing lying lips or a lying pen, in the service of Jehovah, as any of our critics to-day" (p. 294). "Let only the effect be imagined had Ezra interpolated his reading with the occasional explanation that this or that principal ordinance, given forth by him as a law of Moses in the wilderness, was really a private concoction of some unknown priest in Babylon—perchance his own!" This line of argument does insufficient justice to the fact that the distinction between truth and falsehood is largely the product of lengthy training, aided enormously in the last few centuries by the growth of the exact sciences. Science by a variety of instruments succeeds in eliminating the personal equation from large classes of statements; but where the practice of eliminating it has not been cultivated, the rebuke contained in these paragraphs can be easily incurred with absolutely no intent to deceive. What to the trained mind seems a concoction seems to the untrained to be a reality, a necessary deduction from the premises. Nor does the author's own theory of the Pentateuch as given above keep quite clear of the reproach. For if any paragraph headed "and the Lord spake unto Moses saying" contains matter not actually delivered by Moses, it becomes a concoction as much as if it had been put together by Ezra.

We have then to fall back on internal evidence, in which, owing to the strong subjective element, certainty is not easily attained. In his discussions, however, it seems clear that Dr. Orr has exposed the fancifulness of many current

theories, has shown possibilities that have been perhaps unnoticed of reconciling discrepancies, and has even done something towards rehabilitating such portions of the Old Testament as the Books of Chronicles. For any final settlement of the issues between him and his opponents we can only look with modest hope rather than with expectation to archaeology, which may succeed in unearthing fragments of codes or chronicles that will decide the fate of many a conjecture. The paganism that preceded the reform of Josiah appears to have been far too systematic for us to doubt that it had its laws and bye-laws ; and the official chronicles of the kings who favoured polytheism were assuredly written in the spirit of the monarchs whom they celebrated. Fragments of these would be a welcome supplement to the information preserved in the Bible. So temperate and learned a statement of the conservative case as that which Dr. Orr has provided will be welcome even to those whose sympathies are entirely with the other side.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

TARSUS.

XI. THE GREEKS IN TARSUS.

THE events in Cilicia in 171 B.C., described in the previous chapter of this study, introduced a new period in the history of Tarsus. It was henceforth a Greek city-state, governing itself in all internal matters through its own elective magistrates, and exercising certain sovereign rights such as the striking of its own autonomous coins. In various respects, and especially in all relations to foreign states, Tarsus undoubtedly must have been subject to the Seleucid kings : that was a necessity of the Empire. The relation of a free city such as Tarsus now was, to the central government of the Seleucid Empire is, however, quite obscure ; and until some of the cities of this class are excavated and the whole subject carefully studied, it is impossible to speak about details.

For our present purposes it is extremely important to determine what was the character of the constituent population of the free city of Tarsus. It would consist of the former population together with a certain body of new citizens, introduced in the manner and for the purpose already described. All that can be learned or conjectured about the older city has been already stated in the preceding chapter. It now remains to ask what evidence can be found as to the new citizens introduced in 171-170 B.C.

It has been shown¹ that in their colonial foundations, the Seleucid kings were obliged to trust mainly to two peoples, the Greeks and the Jews, "to manage, to lead, to train the rude Oriental peasantry in the arts on which civilized life must rest, to organize and utilize their labour

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 130.

and create a commercial system." This class of colonists was even more necessary than soldiers in those colonies.

The Greeks in those Hellenic foundations of Asia Minor were drawn from very diverse sources. The coins, which are our chief authority, mention Achaeans at Eumeneia, Dorians and Ionians at Synnada, Macedonians frequently. We know that Pisidian Antioch was colonized by settlers from Magnesia, and many other examples might be quoted. How and in what circumstances it was that the settlers were selected in each case, no record exists. We can only conjecture in what manner the superabundant population of Greece, finding their own narrow, barren country unfit to offer a career for their energies, poured forth now at one outlet, now at another, as the opportunity was offered in the new foundations established by the Greek kings in western Asia. Such had been the history of Greece in earlier centuries, when Greek cities founded their own colonies. Such is now the case in modern times, when no new cities on the Mediterranean coasts can be founded, and still Greek emigrants go forth in numbers to push their fortunes as the trade of the neighbouring lands opens up.

The Greek settlers in Tarsus and in Cilicia generally at this period seem to have been Argives. Dion Chrysostom addresses the Tarsians as "colonists of the Argives." Strabo, who had visited the city, and Stephanus give the same account. The chief magistrates in Tarsus and in several other Cilician cities bore the Dorian title Demiourgos, which may be taken as a definite proof that the Greek element in the population was mainly Dorian. It is therefore certain that the Tarsians prided themselves on being Dorians of Argos, and that their municipal institutions had something of a Dorian character. It seems also not impossible that some Doric tinge may have marked the Greek

that they spoke ; and, though the scanty inscriptions show no trace of this, such evidence could hardly be expected. The Koine, the common Hellenistic dialect, would naturally establish itself quickly in a city like Tarsus ; and only a few traces of the Doric dialect may perhaps have lingered. Elsewhere I have used this Doric character in Tarsus as foundation for a suggestion that the origin of the Western text of Acts should perhaps be sought there ¹ ; the word *ναυκόρος* used for *νεωκόρος* in Acts xix. 35 in the Bezan Greek is just such a trace as might have survived in Tarsus.

An Argive connexion dating only from 171 B.C. did not satisfy the Tarsian pride of antiquity. The Hellenistic cities of that time loved to invent an origin for themselves in remote Greek mythology. The Tarsians claimed to be descended from the Argives who had gone forth along with Triptolemus in search of the lost Io, the beloved of the god, transformed into a cow by the anger of Hera. It belonged to the ancient Greek mind to seek a mythological prototype and divine guarantee for historical facts ; the first Tarsian Greeks from the Argive land readily believed that they were doing what their ancestors in the heroic age had done ; and this mythological fable soon established itself as the faith of the city. But the same people, who spoke of themselves as descendants of those ancient Argive wanderers, felt no inconsistency in declaring that Tarsus was the foundation of Sardanapalos, and an old Oriental city. Both Strabo and Stephanus of Byzantium repeat these contradictory legends, as if they were quite harmonious.

Modern writers about Tarsus have usually interpreted the mythological tale as furnishing evidence that Tarsus was really colonized from Argos in the remote beginnings of Greek settlement on the Cilician coast. This is a false view of the nature of Greek myth, and inconsistent with

¹ *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 154.

the known facts. The primitive Greek settlers on this coast were "Sons of the Ionian," and came to Cilicia under the direction of the Clarian Apollo, a god of the Ionian coast. They had necessarily and inevitably melted into the Cilician ground-stock, and Tarsus had long become an almost purely Oriental town, in which there is no reason to think that Demiourgoi or any other Greek magistrates were elected. When the new Hellenic city of Tarsus was founded in 171 B.C., the titles and character of the magistrates were determined by the facts of the situation and the origin of the only Greek population in the city, viz. the newly enrolled Greek citizens—not by mythological inventions, which grew more slowly and took their tone from the established institutions of the city.

The use of the term Demiourgos in other cities of Cilicia suggests that Antiochus established some connexion about this time with the land of Argos, and settled bodies of Argives in other Cilician cities whose constitution he remodelled, though in smaller numbers than at Tarsus. Only in Tarsus were the numbers and influence of the Greeks sufficient to constitute at this time a really sovereign Greek City-State, so far as imperial control permitted sovereignty in such a city. The inscriptions of Soloi-Pompeïopolis, near Tarsus, contain considerable traces of Doric dialect.

XII. THE JEWS IN TARSUS.

This section is the most important and fundamental, so far as St. Paul is concerned, in the study of Tarsian history. On the results of this section must depend all our ideas as to the position which the Apostle's family occupied in Tarsus, as to his own origin and birthright, and as to many allied questions.

It is clearly the presumption in the book of Acts that

there was a considerable body of Jews in Tarsus. Paul was at home there among friends of his own race. That this is true to fact hardly any one is likely to dispute ; and it may seem not worth while to prove it by formal evidence. Yet so jealous and sometimes so arbitrary is the fashion in which the book of Acts is usually treated by scholars that a passage of Epiphanius may be quoted about the Jews of Tarsus. In the first book of his treatise against Heresies, No. xxx. (Migne, vol. 41, Epiphanius i. pp. 411-427), he gives an extremely interesting account of a Jew named Joseph, born at Tiberias about A.D. 286,¹ whom Epiphanius had himself known, and from whose lips he had heard the whole story of his life. Joseph, who belonged to a family of high standing and influence in Tiberias, became interested in the Christian teaching, but his thoughts were for a long time carefully hidden from his co-religionists ; he was entrusted with the honourable dignity and duties of an Apostle among them, and finally despatched on a mission with letters to the Jews of Cilicia. He collected from every city of Cilicia the tithes and the firstfruits paid by the Jews in that Province. In a certain city he chanced to be lodged in a house beside the church, and he thus became acquainted and even intimate with the bishop. From the bishop he borrowed a copy of the Gospels, and read the book.

Now Joseph had exercised the powers of the Apostolate with such strictness that he became extremely unpopular with many of the Jews, who began to scrutinize his conduct carefully in the hope of finding some charge to bring against him. Seeking their opportunity, they rushed suddenly into his abode, and caught him in the act of reading the Gospels. They snatched the book out of his hands, seized

¹ See M. Clermont Ganneau in *Quart. Statement Pal. Expl. Fund*, 1901, p. 382.

him and dragged him with blows and shouts and other ill-treatment to the synagogue, and there flogged him. The bishop, hearing of this, hurried to the scene and rescued him from the hands of the Jews.

On another occasion the Jews caught Joseph while travelling, and threw him into the Cydnus. He was carried away by the current, and they thought with delight that he was drowned ; but he escaped. Shortly afterwards he joined the Christians, was baptized, and afterwards promoted to the dignity of a count (*comes*) and member of the Privy Council (*amicus*) of the Emperor Constantine.

In this account Tarsus is not named, but it is mentioned that there were Jews in every city of Cilicia. It is clearly implied, too, that the Cilician Jews were numerous and powerful, otherwise they could not under Christian rule have ventured on such vigorous action against one who was suspected of a leaning towards Christianity. The story plainly shows that no punishment or prosecution took place on account of their assault, though its illegal character is evident (even allowing that considerable freedom was permitted by law to Jews in dealing with a Jew). The fact that the bishop was able to rescue Joseph as soon as he heard of the first assault proves that even in flogging a presumed Christian convert, the Jews were overstepping the authority of the synagogue : while the second and murderous assault was in any circumstances and with any provocation a serious breach of Imperial law. These facts are inexplicable, unless the Cilician Jews had been a powerful body.

Tarsus would certainly be their chief seat in the Province, because it was the centre of trade and finance, and offered the best opportunities for money-making. It would also, naturally, be the place where Joseph took up his abode, when he went to Cilicia on public duty, for it was

the one city from which all the rest could be best affected and where there was most frequent opportunity of coming into contact with the whole of the Cilician Jews. Finally, the Jews of the town where he lived threw him into the Cydnus, therefore they were the Tarsian Jews. They watched their opportunity when Joseph started on a journey towards Mallos or some place on that side, and threw him into the river.¹ He must have been travelling in that direction, because the river is not deep enough to carry away a man in its current, except in the lower part of its course, and Joseph would not have touched the lower course of the river, unless he had been going towards Mallos. Why Epiphanius avoids mentioning the name of Tarsus, and merely speaks of "a certain city," I cannot explain. Perhaps he wished to avoid bringing such a charge against the city by name.

In passing we observe several interesting points in this story. In the first place the feeling between Jews and Christians was very bitter and intolerant; but it was almost as strong between Jews and pagans or Samaritans. The Jews would not permit any Greek (i.e. pagan), or Samaritan, or Christian to live in the district of Galilee where they were strongest; it had been impossible to build a church in any of the towns or villages there, and especially in Tiberias, Sepphoris, Nazareth, and Capernaum. Such a fact is not favourable to the existence of an unbroken Christian tradition in those towns.

On the other hand there was some intercourse privately between individual Jews and Christians. Joseph was on friendly terms with the bishop of Tarsus, while he was still a Jewish Apostle. Hillel, the Patriarch of Tiberias,

¹ The supposition that the Jews of some other city followed Joseph for such a distance as to be able to throw him into the Cydnus is violent and improbable.

when near death, summoned the bishop who was nearest that city to visit him.¹ The pretext was that the bishop's services as a physician were required; but every Jew in Tiberias must soon have been aware that a Christian bishop was attending their Patriarch, even though they did not know that he was secretly administering the sacrament. In later times such a visit could hardly have occurred. We observe, also, that it is assumed by all that the bishop was qualified to act as a physician. The importance of the medical profession in the Lycaonian and Cappadocian Church during the fourth century was described in the *EXPOSITOR*, January 1906, p. 42. It would almost appear that the bishop was expected to possess some medical skill, which should be at the service of his congregation and of strangers.

There is, accordingly, no doubt that a strong body of Jews inhabited Tarsus. The only question is as to their status in the city: were they merely resident strangers, or had they the full rights of citizens, i.e. of burgesses? The difference in a Hellenic city was profound. There were in all the chief commercial cities of the Mediterranean coasts large bodies of such resident strangers. Many of these became permanent inhabitants of the city, and their families lived there generation after generation. But such persons did not become citizens by right of birth or hereditary connexion with the city. They and their descendants remained outside of the city (in the Hellenic sense). They had no share in its patriotism and its religion. They could freely retain and practise their own religious rites, however alien these were to the religion of the city where they lived. It was usual for a group of such resident

¹ The Latin translation in the Migne edition calls him the bishop of Tiberias; but this is a false rendering of the Greek. No Christians were allowed to live in Tiberias.

strangers to form themselves into a religious association for the proper celebration of their own ritual. Thus they carried their own religion with them into the heart of Greece and were protected by Greek law in the performance of ritual which was forbidden to true citizens—though this prohibition was rarely enforced and practically almost inoperative. It was in this way that foreign and Oriental religions spread in the Greek cities, though nominally forbidden on pain of death and stigmatized as unworthy, superstitious, and un-Hellenic by the more educated among the people.

Especially the Jews dwelt in considerable bodies in various Hellenic cities, where they did not possess any rights as burgess-citizens, forming a simple association with synagogue or place of prayer by seashore or on the bank of a stream (as at Philippi), which aroused attention and attracted proselytes, though it repelled and was hated by the majority.

The question arises whether the Jews at Tarsus were mere resident strangers of this kind. This seems disproved by all that can be gathered about that city.

The view which we take is that the Jews of Tarsus were, as a body, citizens with full burgess rights. That does not, of course, exclude the possibility that there were some or even many resident stranger Jews in the city. The right of citizenship could only be got by inheritance, apart from exceptional cases in which it was bestowed by a formal law on an individual as a reward for services rendered to the city; but such cases were comparatively few in any one city,¹ for the right was jealously guarded. There was no desire to increase the number of citizens, but rather

¹ It would, of course, be easy to collect from all the Greek cities a list of many individuals to whom citizenship was granted and recorded in inscriptions that have been preserved.

the aim of everybody was to keep the number small: philosophers and social theorists taught that the ideal of a city could be attained only in a comparatively limited size, while the ordinary selfish individual thought that the advantages of citizenship would be diminished if they were shared with new citizens.

There were occasional crises in the history of a Greek City-State, when the number of citizens was enlarged by the incorporation of considerable groups of new members. Such crises were, naturally, exceptional and rare: they occurred from various causes—sometimes on account of a great disaster, which had seriously weakened the State and diminished the body of citizens to a dangerous extent, sometimes through external causes and the interference of a power outside the State. In such cases the body of new citizens was not, as a rule, incorporated in any of the older Tribes of the city, but in a new Tribe which was instituted for the purpose.¹

Now there is no evidence, and no probability, that the body of the citizens of Tarsus was ever enlarged in this way, after it had been founded as a Greek City-State by Antiochus Epiphanes in 171. While we are only imperfectly acquainted with the history of Tarsus, there is no sign that any such crisis ever occurred. The reasonable probability is that the foundation of 171 was permanent, and determined the constitution of the city until the time of Augustus, when there was an oligarchic and timocratic movement, limiting the number of burgesses instead of increasing them, and making a money-qualification.

The reasons for the view that there was a body of Jewish citizens in Tarsus are as follows.

¹ On the "Tribes" into which the population of a Hellenic city was divided, see the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, pp. 146-150, or any work on Greek Antiquities.

In the first place, St. Paul was a citizen, as he himself asserted most emphatically in very dramatic circumstances at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 39). This implies that he was a member of one of the Tribes into which those Hellenic Colonies were always divided. Now the members of a Tribe were closely bound to one another by common religious rites, which were performed at every meeting of the Tribe. In every Hellenic city the common religion of the Tribe was an extremely important element in the life and the thought and the patriotism of all citizens. No man could be a citizen except as a member of a Tribe; and the tribal bond was sacred and intimate. Now no Jew could possibly become a member of an ordinary Tribe in a Greek city, because he would have been obliged to participate frequently in a pagan ritual, which even the most degraded of Jews would hardly have faced. There was no possible way by which Jews could become citizens of a Greek city, except by having a Tribe set apart for them, in which they could control the religious rites and identify them with the service of the synagogue. This method was adopted in Alexandria, where the Jews were all enrolled in the Tribe called "the Macedonians"; and there can be no doubt that the same method was followed in all the Seleucid foundations, where a Jewish body of colonists was settled.

Accordingly, inasmuch as St. Paul was a Tarsian citizen and his father before him was a citizen, there must have been a body of Jewish citizens constituting the Tribe in which they were enrolled. There can never have been a single Jewish citizen of a Greek city: there must always have been a group of Jews forming a Tribe, holding together in virtue of their common Jewish religion; and it may be regarded as practically certain that the synagogue was their tribal centre, where they met not only for religious purposes, but also for judging all cases affecting their tribal

union and rights. In this way Joseph of Tiberias was dragged to the synagogue and there flogged, as has just been described.

This train of reasoning seems indisputable ; and it has been fully accepted by Professor E. Schürer.¹ Yet such indirect arguments, however unanswerable they be, never can carry the same complete conviction to the reader as a definite and direct proof that there was in Tarsus a body of Jewish citizens ; and our next argument is that such a proof is furnished by Romans xvi. 7-21, where six persons are called “ kinsmen ” by St. Paul. The word can hardly mean here kinsmen by right of birth and blood in the ordinary sense² ; for there is reason to think that the family to which the Apostle belonged had not come over to the Christian Church in such numbers, but rather had condemned his action and rejected him.³ Nor can it here mean simply members of the Jewish nation, for many of the others who are mentioned in this passage without this epithet were undoubtedly Jews. The careful distinction between the various epithets in the passage is very instructive. The writer was deeply moved, and his tenderest feelings were roused, when he was writing the words, and each epithet is full of emotion, a piece of his heart and his life, as it were. I believe that there is in the term “ kinsmen ” here an instance of the same strong deep feeling for his native city, which is found in Acts xxi. 39 (as was pointed out in the preceding chapter) : the word “ kinsman ” here means fellow-citizen and doubtless also fellow-tribesman, for all the six were probably Jews and therefore members of the same Tribe in Tarsus. This use of the word

¹ See his article on the Jews of the Diaspora, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 105.

² “ Kinsmen according to the flesh ” in Romans ix. 3.

³ *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 35 ff., 310-312.

“kinsmen” was idiomatically Greek, and seems to have risen in other cases to the mouth of the Greek when his feelings of patriotism were moved.¹ Thus, for example, when the Greeks of Ephesus came to Agrippa to ask him to eject their Jewish fellow-citizens from participation in the rights of citizenship,² they declared that “if the Jews are kinsmen to us, they ought to worship our gods,” i.e. to practise the religion of the city, participation in which was the natural and (to the Greek mind) necessary expression of patriotism and kinship. This kindred, which is spoken of as existing between the Jews of Ephesus and the Greeks of Ephesus, was their common citizenship; and it was in the same sense that Paul calls those six men his “kinsmen” in Romans xvi. 7, 11, 21.

In the third place, a proof of the existence of a body of Jewish citizens in Tarsus can be drawn from a passage in Philostratus's biography of Apollonius of Tyana, vi. 34. Not long after the end of the Jewish insurrection and the capture of Jerusalem, Titus, as co-Emperor with his father, chanced to be offering public sacrifice on behalf of the State (probably in Rome), when delegates representing the city of Tarsus approached him with a petition about some important interests of their city. These ambassadors were, it is needless to say, citizens of Tarsus. Titus answered that he would himself act as their ambassador to his father Vespasian, and lay their case before him. Hereupon Apollonius, who was present in the train of his friend Titus, intervened and said to him, “If I prove to you that some of these delegates are enemies of your father and yourself, and went as envoys to Jerusalem to promote an insurrection,

¹ An examination of the meaning and use of *συγγενής* and *συγγένεια* in Greek is much needed. The lexicons, even Steph. Thesaurus, rarely give any help in such matters.

² See the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 152; Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xii. 3, 2, § 126.

making themselves secret allies of your most openly declared enemies, what treatment shall they receive of you ? ” “ What,” said Titus, “ but death ? ” “ Is it not then disgraceful,” replied Apollonius, “ to take vengeance on the spot, but to postpone kindnesses to a later time, to inflict death on your own responsibility, but to reserve favours until you consult another about them ? ”

This dilemma which Apollonius put to Titus depended for its effect on the fact (which must have been well known) that many Jews were citizens of Tarsus. Apollonius was on bad terms with that city,¹ and Titus was quite prepared to hear him denounce the Tarsians ; and also, as there were many Jewish citizens in Tarsus, he was quite ready to believe that some of the envoys were Jews, and that the suggestion that they had been plotting treason in Jerusalem was seriously intended. In truth, it is highly probable that some of the envoys were Jews, and that this suggested to Apollonius the stratagem which he practised. No person would have thought of suggesting or believing that Greeks would have gone on an embassy to Jerusalem to plot treason with Jews : the race hatred was notoriously too strong and bitter.

The seeming accusation which Apollonius made with such ready wit must have been a plausible and probable one in itself, otherwise Titus would not have been taken in by it. Its only plausibility arose from the Jewish citizenship in Tarsus, and the known fact that many wealthy and prominent Tarsians were Jews. When Apollonius retorted

¹ Philostratus mentions this. Apollonius on his visit to Tarsus had sternly rebuked the Tarsians for their luxury and wealth, and became extremely unpopular in the city. After the incident with Titus, Tarsian feeling changed and he was revered as a benefactor and “ founder ” of the city. The title “ founder ” was often bestowed by the Hellenic cities on persons who had done special service to a city, or caused some advantage, or built some public building.

with his sharp-pointed dilemma, Titus was charmed. Though he had been caught in the act of threatening death as the punishment for a supposititious and pretended crime, he extricated himself from the unpleasant situation with the genial humour characteristic of both his father and himself, granting the Tarsians' petition, and saying that his father would pardon him for yielding to truth and to Apollonius.

All these three arguments unite in this, that each shows us a situation and words which are full of meaning and point, if there were Jewish citizens in Tarsus, but insipid and pointless if there were not. Considering how scanty is the information that has come down to us about the constitution of Tarsus and the other Hellenic cities of Asia Minor, it is fortunate that on this important matter so much evidence has been preserved, and that a body of Jewish citizens can confidently be regarded as having formed an important element in the Tarsian City-State. Our conclusion is that Dorian Greeks from Argos and Jews formed the main body of the new colonists settled there by Antiochus Epiphanes in 171-170 B.C.

XIII. THE JEWS SETTLED IN TARSUS IN 171 B.C.

The next question is when this body of Jewish citizens was settled in Tarsus. We have seen that they must have been settled there as a body, and not from time to time as individuals; that the settlement must have formed part of a general reconstruction of the city; that there was such a reconstruction of Tarsus in 171 B.C.; and that there is no sign or evidence of any later reconstruction having occurred. The natural inference is that a body of Jews was settled in Tarsus by Antiochus Epiphanes, as part of the free self-governing city which he founded in that year. I see no way in which this inference can be evaded.

Such a settlement was in accordance with the regular Seleucid practice. Similar settlements of Jews had been made in many other cases by the predecessors of Antiochus, and on an especially large scale by his father in the cities of Lydia and Phrygia not long before. Even if there were no record of Jewish citizens in Tarsus, it would be safe to speak of the probability that he followed the established Seleucid principle, and settled Jews as citizens in Tarsus.

Professor E. Schürer, however, though he cannot suggest any way of evading this inference, argues that it "appears very improbable in view of the hostility of Antiochus to the Jews." Antiochus, it is true, became the enemy of the rebel Jews in Palestine; but that was at a later time. In 171 he considered himself as the best friend of the Jewish race, and was so considered by many of the most influential Jews in Jerusalem. He regarded Jerusalem with special interest, and as a token of his favour bestowed on it his own name. To the Jewish reactionary party, who carried out their successful revolt, it seemed an outrage to rename Jerusalem "Antiocheia"; but Antiochus was innocent of any such intention. The truth was that the king merely carried into effect a great scheme of national education in Palestine, the best that the philosophers of the time could conceive; and that the scheme was highly popular with the aristocracy, but hated by the common people of the country. This scheme of national education was not even originated by Antiochus. It had been the settled policy of the Seleucid kings since they became the lords of Palestine. Antiochus Epiphanes merely walked in the beaten path, the ultimate aim of which was to educate Palestine and all the rest of the Seleucid dominions in Greek civilization, language, and manners. Those who still regard the study of Greek as so valuable that it should be enforced in every school in our remote age and land, ought not to

accuse Antiochus of outrage and hostility because he wished to teach Greek in Jerusalem and to bring the Jews up to the level of the highest civilization (as he believed) of the time.

This way of describing the situation in Palestine before the Maccabæan rising is no frivolous trifling with a serious subject. It is the literal truth, and it is also the spiritual truth. The Seleucid policy, which Antiochus Epiphanes continued, was a noble and generous one, and produced excellent results in Western Asia generally. It attempted, wisely, deliberately, and with full consciousness, to produce a conciliation and amalgamation of Oriental ideas and Western education ; and in many ways it offers still a model of the best method of essaying this most important problem in social development. But the same policy which is wise and beneficial in one country may be unwise and hurtful in another. It was quite true, as Antiochus and his predecessors saw, that the Jews had much to learn from the Greeks ; but they had more to lose than to gain by being Hellenized, if Hellenization meant the abandoning of all that was distinctive in Judaism. The Maccabæan rising was guilty of many faults and was far from being an unmixed good to the world ; but it did preserve the Jewish race from being merged in Hellenism and kept it free for its great destiny.

So successful had the Seleucid policy already been that the "advanced" party among the Jews now urged Antiochus to take more decided steps. He acted in concert with the Hellenizing Jews, who claimed to be the most enlightened and certainly were the wealthy and the powerful part of the community. The building of a gymnasium, the introduction of the fashion of young men wearing hats and in general making themselves as Hellenized as possible—such were the outrages of which Antiochus had been guilty

when the rebellion first began. These cannot be condemned by us as grave offences, in themselves ; but they were an attempt to force Hellenic customs on the Jews. The gymnasium implied the Greek fashion of practising athletics naked ; and this fashion was the cause of real evils in Greece. The hat has always been and still is an abomination to the true Asiatic ; it is still the mark of a European in Mohammedan lands. For Jews to wear the hat was to denationalize themselves.

Antiochus, therefore, even after 171, was in no true sense an enemy of the Jews. He was only an enemy of a party among the Jews. That party became dominant in Palestine, and hence arose war with Palestine. But none of this had taken place in 171 ; and the same policy which made the king eager to Hellenize Palestine made him introduce Jewish colonists into Tarsus and doubtless into other Cilician towns. It is, indeed, highly probable that there were already Jews in Cilicia, and that Antiochus both bestowed the rights of citizenship in the remodelled cities on the old resident Jews, and increased their numbers by bringing into the country more families of Jews. Even after the Maccabæan war began, it is not probable that Antiochus ceased to trust or favour the Jews in the northern part of his realm. He would do so only if they joined or sympathized with the rebellion ; and at first they were not likely to do so, for they were rather on the Hellenizing side. They could not live in a Hellenic city without learning that many Hellenic customs, hated by the zealots, were harmless and even good. They did not regard games and athletics with such horror as the zealots did. St. Paul draws his metaphors and similes so freely from such Greek customs that it is impossible to think even he, strict Pharisee as he claimed to be, felt any detestation of Greek games and Greek ideas : had he been the pure Jew that many

scholars fancy him to have been, he must have regarded all those Greek things as an abomination.

The conclusion is that from 171 onwards there was in Tarsus a body of citizens of Jewish blood. They were a privileged class in many ways, Josephus points out emphatically that the Seleucid kings showed great favour to all the Jewish colonists, conceded many things which the Jewish scruples required, set them free from all obligation to do anything contrary to their religion and their law. We must therefore regard St. Paul as sprung from one of the families which got the Tarsian citizenship in 171 B.C., and reject the story (in itself an impossible one) recorded by St. Jerome, that he or his parents had emigrated from Gischala in Palestine, when it was captured by the Romans.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE SITE OF CAPERNAUM.

WHERE was the town which was the home of Jesus Christ, and the chief centre of His work, during the three years of His public ministry? It is an old controversy, not yet settled to the satisfaction of experts. From the days of Dr. Robinson, of New York—the pioneer of Palestinian topography—whose *Researches* are still unrivalled and indispensable to all students of the subject, and who in 1836 fixed on Khan Minyeh as the site, down to Carl Ritter (who in 1850 decided on Tell Hum, and tried to prove it was the place) there have been many oscillations of opinion between the two—the only possible two—sites. Dean Stanley in 1856 reverted to Khan Minyeh, followed by Keim in 1867. Then Dr. Thomson, Sir Charles Wilson, Schenkel, Schürer (from 1869 to 1874), approved of Tell Hum; while most of the greater experts, from Major C. R. Conder in 1879, Selah Merrill, George Adam Smith, Von Soden, Rider Haggard, and Professor Sanday down to 1903, support Khan Minyeh.

I have formed a very decided opinion in favour of Khan Minyeh; and, from aneroid observations on the spot in January of this year, have perhaps obtained a tiny ray of fresh light on the fascinating problem. Before presenting it, a glance may be given to the only other possible site suggested; not from any evidence in its favour, but from the eminence of the distinguished Biblical and Natural History expert, recently gone from us, Canon Tristram, of Durham. He will be long remembered from his books on Palestine; and, as one of the main points in the evidence we have to deal with concerns the fountain which watered the plain of Gennesareth, to which Josephus refers, Tristram's guess as to that fountain must be considered. After much research he thought it was the fountain of Ain-em-Madowwerah (the round fountain) in the centre of

the plain of Gennesareth, which he describes in a very interesting manner ; referring especially to his discovery in it of the *coracin* fish, about which Josephus writes. But there is no sign whatsoever of any kind of ruin near this fountain, and nothing to lead us to suppose that “a city” ever existed there ; while the *coracin* fish which ascend from the lake are to be found in other streams and fountains.

Putting aside, then, that guess of Tristram’s, there are just two other places on the shore of the lake at one of which the Capernaum of old must have been situated, the modern Khan Minyeh and Tell Hum. Before discussing their respective claims, the following points should be noted. Wherever it was (and it was always called a city, *πόλις*), it was (1) a military station, in which a body of Roman soldiers lived (St. Matt. viii. 5) ; (2) it was a place where tax collectors sat at the receipt of custom (St. Matt. ix. 9) ; (3) it was a city made important by the residence of an official representing the king (St. John iv. 46) ; (4) it was close to the shore of the lake (St. Matt. iv. 13) ; (5) it was also near the plain of Gennesareth (St. John vi. 17–21 ; St. Mark vi. 53 ; St. Matt. xiv. 34).

Briefly to describe these two sites. Khan Minyeh is now the ruin of an inn or caravansery, a little way above the “fountain of the fig tree,” *Ain-et-Tin*, at the northern end of the plain of Gennesareth. It is near the lake, it is in Gennesareth, and it is on the main highway of communication with Damascus on the north-east, and Jerusalem on the south. Tell Hum is four miles further north than Khan Minyeh, and, while also on the lake, is a mile and a half from its northern end, where the Jordan enters it ; a now ruined station, where some remarkable ruins have been unearthed, and whence the ground rises inland very gently up towards the probable site of Chorazin, three miles to the north-west.

We get very little help—scarcely even a remote clue—from the words which describe these two hypothetical sites of Capernaum. Kephar Nahum=the village of Nahum, could not have been contracted (or corrupted) into Tell Hum; and as Tell signifies a “mound,” and there is no mound of any kind at the place in question, it is discredited *ab initio*. Tell Hum cannot be a likely contraction for Nahum’s mound. It would have needed to be *Tell-Num*. But there is no “tell,” no “mound” of any kind, near the place now quite inaccurately designated “Tell Hum.” The spot thus named may have been near one of the minor roads of the district leading northwards, but it could never have been a “Custom’s City,” such an one as that from which St. Matthew was called.

One of the most important, although indirect, witnesses as to the site of Capernaum is Josephus. As military governor of Galilee, a few years after the death of Christ, he commanded 10,000 men, and tells us that he sent a captain with 2,000 soldiers to oppose Sylla, the Roman general; but that [he himself met with an accident, falling from his horse into a quagmire; that he was injured in the wrist, and carried into a village named Cepharnome, or Capernaum. He was feverish all day and “removed at night to Tarichæa.”¹ The whole passage is so well known that it need not be quoted at length. The important point is this. If the accident occurred in the delta at the mouth of the Jordan, or even near the modern Tell Hum, he may have been carried as far down the shore of the lake as the fountain of Ain-et-Tin, and there been taken by boat—of which there were hundreds on the lake—to Tarichæa, which he evidently wished to reach, and would prefer to reach it “by the way of the sea,” rather than by taking the roadway (the *via maris*) behind Tiberias. Tiberias was in the

¹ See *Jewish Wars*, book III. chap. x. § 8.

hands of the Romans, and Tarichæa was held by the Jews.

More important than the indirect testimony of Josephus is the account in the Gospels of the disciples going from the eastern side of the lake after the feeding of the multitude to Capernaum (St. John vi. 17), where it is said that they "were soon at the land whither they were going." But St. Matthew and St. Mark both say that "they came to the land of Gennesareth," and there it was that Jesus was found next morning in the synagogue by the people who sought Him. Some have supposed that if the feeding of the mixed multitude took place on the north-eastern shore of the lake (which is certainly the most probable site), the vast crowd would be sent round by the northern delta across the Jordan in some way, and downwards to their various cities or villages on that western shore; and that therefore the disciples would take ship, and sail over to such a spot as Tell Hum now is. But why should they go due west across the lake? Why not rather south-west, towards their village fisher-home Bethsaida, and Capernaum near at hand?

I think, from all the evidence discoverable, that there were two Bethsaidas; (1) the Bethsaida-Julius up on the delta beyond the inflow of the Jordan, the town rebuilt and enlarged in honour of a scion of the Roman Emperor; and (2) the fishing village lower down near Capernaum, which was the dwelling-place of Andrew, Philip, Peter, and the rest of those noble "fisher-folk" of Galilee.

Next, it is almost certain that a large "city" once existed on the site of the present ruin of Khan Minyeh. This is evidenced by the ruins which are to be seen above it at Tell Oreimeh, where the synagogue (which our Lord frequented) may have been; and the ruins below, between it and the sea.

Again, and still more important, it is certain that the

great road for caravan-traffic, between Judea the whole west of Galilee, and away to Damascus on the north-east, must have passed close to this ruined khan of Minyeh, and then struck almost due northwards. Nothing but a mere foot-track led up the north-western shore of the lake to where Tell Hum now stands. Where would it ever have led to, except to hamlets and villages of the poor? The great Damascus road passed on by Khan-Jubb-Yusef to the north; and—what is most important by way of evidence—there would certainly be a station at this particular spot of Khan Minyeh for the collection of the customs that were due. We are told that it was when “sitting at the receipt of custom” that St. Matthew was “called” to be an apostle; but we have no evidence of a custom-house, or of the likelihood of its existence, on the minor pathway by Tell Hum.

And now as to the *Fountain* of which Josephus writes—which watered the plain of Gennesareth—it certainly was not the *Ain-em-Madowwerah* which Canon Tristram thought it was, and where he found the coracin fish; and it was not *Ain-et-Tin* (the fountain of the fig tree), which is almost on the same level as the latter. Neither of these could convey water to irrigate the plain. But comparatively close at hand, at Et-Tabigah, there is the second largest—if not the most copious—fountain in Galilee, a wondrous cluster of springs; and, what is much more important, the remains of an old aqueduct exist there, an aqueduct cut across the face of the rock between the fountain and the plain of Gennesareth, showing that water had, at some distant time, been brought from this fountain southwards, and round the cliff artificially, to water the garden and the plain underneath. Some have fancied that this rock-cut channel was a roadway for horses. It is impossible. It is too narrow for horses to pass each other, and it bears traces,

in its ancient masonry, of being a water channel. But the most important point of all is its height, as compared with the fountain source of the spring, Et-Tabigah. I was advised before going out to Galilee that the only thing I could do, which had not been done by many visitors before me, was to determine heights. And so I took a pocket aneroid barometer, which had been a trustworthy assistant on many a Swiss mountain and British height before. Numerous writers have alluded to this aqueduct, many drawings of it have been given ; but the question of questions was the height of the fountain, or stream, of Et-Tabigah, in relation to this now ruined aqueduct. By careful measurement I found that, at its highest point, the aqueduct is 10 to 15 feet lower than the spring, thus proving that it at least *could* convey the water in an artificial stream which might water the whole plain of Gennesareth. The Romans of old were splendid builders of aqueducts—as their imperial city and many another proves—but the plan of bringing water from the glen (or waddy) of Tabigah to irrigate Gennesareth seems to a modern eye so simply obvious that it is a mystery how any doubt can exist as to the actual fact. To those who are interested in the question of how the whole plain of Gennesareth could be watered artificially by this aqueduct, an examination of the way in which much larger valleys in the Canary Islands are irrigated by much tinier streamlets may be suggested. Nothing surprised me more in the long descent to Orotava under Teneriffe than the way in which a small stream of water from a spring may be made the source of supply to many miles of agricultural land.

It is also worth noting that as the aqueduct rounds the rock, and descends to where Khan Minyeh now is, there is a break in its course, which suggests that, from this point, the water may have been carried by other

artificial methods, known to all early agriculturists, down to the valley below.

I come now to the historical testimony and teaching, if it be not evidence. It must always be remembered that the early Christian writers were not topographers, or geographers. How could they be so? They accepted tradition gladly. They did not scrutinize collateral testimony as to details, when they considered that they had the central evidence of all in their own hands. But, afterwards, the spirit of inquiry was aroused, and it is most instructive to trace its evolution. Arculfus in the seventh century, St. Willibald in the eighth, Eugesippus in the twelfth, Brocardius in the thirteenth, and Quarasimus in the seventeenth, give us many suggestions, many conjectures, and some dates. The last writer says that what was Capernaum is a ruin called *Minieh* (in Arabic). Now we find, in the *Talmud*, that the Christians were named *Mînîm*=sorcerers or sinners. Capernaum was, to the Jews, the city of the *Mînîm*, or *Menai*, during almost the whole of the Middle Age, down nearly to the rise of our modern era. Thus, we have an important link in the chain of evidence in the very word Khan Minyeh.

The ruins at Tell Hum have recently been, and are still being, excavated; but there is no evidence in what has been discovered against the Khan Minyeh site of Capernaum. In my opinion, if the arguments on the subject may be divided into positive and negative, the negative ones are all against Tell Hum, while the positive ones are in favour of Khan Minyeh. There may have been a costly synagogue erected there by some wealthy Jew, and when the city—let us suppose that it was one of 16,000 people like the rest—was decadent, its stones may have been carried elsewhere, as we know that many marble ones were taken down to Tiberias, and some of them converted into lime. But of

the ruins at Tell Hum—which are perhaps the most interesting of all which exist on the shores of the lake—many may have been (and most likely were) of a much later date than the Christian era. It has been conjectured by Von Soden that, after that era began, some Jews from Tiberias settled at Tell Hum, and built a synagogue there.

I must not omit to mention the kindly father Biever, at the hospice of Et-Tabigah. He is a German, now long resident in Palestine, a farmer as much as a priest—because he has no flock to tend! none of the Roman fraternity to minister to—but is a most intelligent, thoughtful, kindly man, with much out-of-the-way learning, and a most genial personality. I cannot quite make out what his opinions are as to the site of Capernaum. He spoke to me in a decided way as to Tell Hum being the site, and I find quite different opinions given by him to other visitors to his hospice. All I can say is that the good man, referring to the ruins recently discovered at Tell Hum, said, “If they are not the ruins of Capernaum, of whatever are they the ruins?” It was not a satisfactory question in reply to a puzzled investigator; and it recalled a boyish experience. I once heard a Roman priest lecture on the supposed discovery of a relic of St. Mungo, at the close of which he said—holding up a tiny bone to his audience—“If this is not the great toe of St. Mungo, whose toe is it?” No; we cannot settle questions of topography by a series of negative questions; and I turned from father Biever’s query to the more positive and suggestive evidence I had found in the researches of Mr. MacGregor (Rob Roy MacGregor), who has so laboriously traversed, and so acutely written on, this lake of lakes, and has found evidence of subaqueous ruins in it below Khan Minyeh; thus connecting the scattered evidence of buildings to the north and the west with those long buried in the water.

Other evidence exists which leads me to localize Capernaum at Khan Minyeh, but I do not give it here and now. If there is any defender of Tell Hum who cares to write in its defence, I shall most respectfully consider his arguments, and deal with them in the light of the evidence at my disposal.

WILLIAM KNIGHT.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.*¹

XLI. THE DENUNCIATION OF THE TRAITOR, XIV. 17-21.

IN the evening Jesus and His disciples came to the guest-chamber where the supper was prepared, and took their last meal together ; and the Master spoke to His followers for the last time of the Kingdom of God. The next few hours were crowded with poignant memories, and of this last conversation, only a few sentences on two topics are recorded. Indeed, at this time Jesus seems to have been preoccupied and reserved, and His manner might quell the spirits of His companions, so that the meal proceeded in silence, broken only by the brief utterances called for by ritual or etiquette. He may have received a warning. Treacherous plots are seldom kept secret for days together. When Jesus spoke it was only to plunge His hearers into deeper gloom by His ominous words.

“In truth I tell you that one of you shall betray me, one of you who are eating with me.”²

The disciples broke in upon Him with eager protests :

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical or dogmatic account of Christ ; they simply attempt to state the impression which the Second Gospel would make upon a reader who had no other sources of information as to Jesus, and was unacquainted with Christian doctrine.

² These paraphrases of verses 18 and 20 might be challenged ; they would not be *prima facie* the most natural renderings of the Greek taken as isolated sentences ; but they are required by the context. Perhaps the Greek misrepresents an original Aramaic or has been corrupted by parallel narratives.

“ Surely it is not I ! surely it is not I ! ”

Judas would not be the least insistent. Others may have had thoughts of treachery or desertion, and yet have rallied to loyalty in these very protests ; but to Judas the words of Jesus set an irrevocable seal upon his evil purpose. The disciples were left to the answer of their own consciences ; Jesus merely answered that one of the twelve would betray Him.

“ It is one of the twelve, one of you who are sharing this meal with me.”¹

Then for a moment the veil that hides the inner life of Jesus is lifted. “ The Son of Man,” He says, “ goes His way, treading the path ordained for Him in the Scriptures.” His mind was still occupied with the issue of the crisis ; He had meditated afresh on the teaching of the Old Testament as to the career and experiences of the Messiah, but He had found no gleam of hope for the immediate present ; from these oracles came words of doom ; the Son of Man must die ; but alas that He must be ushered to the gates of death by a traitor, one of His intimate friends. His wounded heart mourned over the failure of His disciple.

“ Alas for that man by whom the Son of Man is to be betrayed ; it had been well for that man if he had not been born.”

XLII. THE NEW COVENANT, XIV. 22-25.

The meal went on, and by and by Jesus spoke again of His death ; and after the manner of the ancient prophets He spoke not only in words, but also by acted symbols ; He took bread, blessed it, divided it into portions, and distributed it among them, saying, “ Take this, it is my body.” In the same way He took a cup of wine, and gave thanks, and passed it to them, and they all drank of it.

¹ See note 2 on previous page.

¶Then He said, "This is my blood shed for many as the blood of a covenant. In truth I tell you that I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God."

These sombre enigmatic words fell heavily on the ears of the disciples, and stirred uneasy questionings; they implied that Jesus was to be offered in sacrifice, and the disciples were invited to partake symbolically of the flesh and blood of the victim. Those who partook of the flesh of victims at sacrificial feasts were the worshippers by whom and for whom the sacrifices were offered. Jesus therefore was about to die for them; but were they offering Him up, giving Him to death? He had said that one of them was to betray Him; was that what He meant? But He seemed Himself to be courting death. They could not understand Him. His death might involve their ruin; at any rate it disappointed their hopes and ambitions. How then was He dying for them? Then, too, in the sacrifices the worshippers did not partake of the blood; that was poured out at the altar as God's portion. They were to drink wine as representing the blood of Jesus offered as a sacrificial victim; such a symbol was unique and awful for Jews; it suggested terrible Gentile rites in which the worshippers fed symbolically on the flesh and blood of dead gods.

Then by one of those sudden and seemingly inconsequent transitions which perplexed His followers so that they could not understand His sayings,¹ He spoke of drinking wine with them at a royal banquet.

Thus a momentary glimpse into the mind of Jesus shows that He accepted death as inevitable, in the conviction that He was dying for those who believed on Him. Beyond death He saw Himself reunited with His followers in the blessed life of the Kingdom of God.

¹ Cf. Mark viii. 17, 21.

XLIII. WARNING OF DENIAL, XIV. 26-31.

The meal over, they sang a hymn, after the usual custom, and left the house to make their way out of the city and spend the night outside, in accordance with the plan followed by Jesus during His visit to Jerusalem. Night had fallen, but the full moon of the Passover season cast its weird alternation of light and darkness. Apparently they had no difficulty in passing the gates ; at these great feasts many of the pilgrims would lodge without the walls, and egress and ingress would not be strictly controlled. By this time the disciples had learnt that they were going to a garden called Gethsemane on the Mount of Olives. When Judas heard this, he felt that his opportunity had come ; indeed if he were to keep faith with the authorities he must be prompt ¹ ; otherwise he might be prevented from fulfilling his bargain by some unforeseen event, or by Jesus' departure from Jerusalem at the end of the feast. Therefore, as they passed along, Judas slipped away and betook himself to the High Priest's. Possibly there were other desertions. After a while Jesus noticed the absence of Judas ; it seemed a presage that others would leave Him ; and that the gradual dwindling of His company of followers would soon be completed, and He would be left quite alone. He turned to those who were still with Him, and told them that Judas would not be alone in his failure.

"Ye shall *all* be shaken from your loyalty, for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."

And again there followed mysterious words that spoke of restoration and reunion.

"But after I rise again, I will go before you into Galilee."

Peter replied, with his wonted impetuosity, ignoring what he did not understand :

¹ St. Mark does not tell us when Judas left Jesus.

“Even though all shall be shaken, I shall not.”

But the months they had spent together had revealed to Jesus the instability of His follower. Peter faithful to the last ! Peter patiently enduring the danger and disgrace of the solitary adherent of a discredited Messiah ! No !

“In truth I tell thee that thou to-day, this very night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice.”

Peter was stung to the heart and protested yet more vehemently :

“If I must die with Thee, I will not deny Thee.”

And his comrades echoed his protests.

XLIV. GETHSEMANE, XIV. 32-41.

When they reached Gethsemane Jesus, as on other occasions, left most of His disciples, and only took with Him Peter and James and John. With these three He sought some inner recess, while the others remained on the outskirts of the garden. He knew now that the suspense of the last few days was at an end, and the critical moment had come. By this time Judas must have betrayed His whereabouts, and the officers would be on the way to arrest Him. Perhaps they might put Him to death on the spot. So now, as often before, He sought God in prayer. When last He prayed thus, supported by the silent sympathy of His three friends, He had been encouraged by the vision of Prophet and Lawgiver, and by a voice from heaven speaking words of approval. But now there was no heavenly vision and no Divine voice. Instead a horror of great darkness fell upon Him ; dismay and distress took possession of Him ; and He said to the three, “My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.”

Hardly an hour ago He had been drinking with His disciples the cup which was the symbol of coming death ; then He had looked on beyond death to the happier fellow-

ship in the Kingdom of God ; but now there is no word of any anticipation of the glory of the Kingdom. Not long since He had asked two of His companions if they could drink of the cup which He was to drink of ; now He asked another question, Must He drink that cup Himself ?

He now separated Himself a little from His three remaining companions ; He bade them stay where they were and watch, while He went forward a little—not out of hearing—and fell on the ground and prayed that if it were possible this hour might pass from Him. “Father ! Father ! all things are possible for Thee, take away this cup from me.”

The three men a little way off listened with sinking hearts ; hitherto with every presage of ruin there had been the calm stern courage of the Master, and the triumphant note of the coming of the Kingdom. If His spirit failed, where should hope or encouragement or strength be found ? Then an irresistible drowsiness crept over them ; they were tired by the long day, worn out by conflicting emotions, and they fell asleep. Later on they woke to find Jesus standing over them ; they might discern the marks of conflict, but as yet their heavy eyes could discover no token of victory. His voice fell upon their ears :

“Asleep, Simon ! Couldst thou not watch one hour ? Watch ye and pray, that temptation may not befall you, for the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.”

Then He left them, and for a while they struggled to keep awake, and again they heard His prayer that He might be spared the coming agony. Then sleep once more overcame them, and they knew nothing till again they half woke and found Him beside them ; and dazed and heavy they knew not what to say to Him ; and as He turned away, they fell asleep again. Then for the third time He came back to them, and they tried to rouse themselves, but He bade them

sleep on and take their rest. The conflict was over ; the victory was won ; His need was past, and their opportunity was lost.¹

But at this moment He caught the gleam of torches and heard footsteps and the sound of voices ; and now at last the Three started up broad awake as He spoke with a sharp note of warning.

“The hour has come ; behold, the Son of Man is being betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us go”—to the other disciples—“Behold, he that betrayeth me is at hand.”

XLV. THE ARREST, XIV. 42-52.

But as He spoke His enemies were upon Him. No doubt they had taken precautions against His escape, had surrounded His company and come up quietly so that they were not perceived till they were close by. We are not told what happened to the other disciples, who were not in Jesus' immediate company ; probably they had no time to give an alarm, but succeeded in joining their brethren. The authorities felt that Jesus was the one important person and treated His followers with contemptuous indifference. Therefore the band charged with the arrest did not at once rush forward and try to seize them all ; such an attempt would have led to confusion in which Jesus might have escaped. It had been arranged that the traitor should indicate Jesus by an unmistakable sign ; he was to go forward and greet Him as a friend. Perhaps Judas imagined that his treachery was still unknown to Jesus, and that this greeting would disarm suspicion and give time for the officers to seize Him. Besides Judas would be close to Jesus, and could help to prevent His escape. Thus as the

¹ The meaning and reference of the word *apekhei*, E.V. “it is enough,” are quite uncertain. In the LXX. it is used in various passages to translate eight or nine different Hebrew words.

hostile band paused, Jesus saw one man separate himself from them and come towards Him. He recognized Judas and discerned his purpose. The traitor, excited, anxious that there should be no mistake, overdid his part; not content with the formal kiss of greeting, he hailed Jesus as "Rabbi!" and kissed Him again and again, till his companions hurrying up laid hands on Jesus and made Him their prisoner.

Men's recollections of this scene were incoherent and fragmentary, but it was remembered afterwards that at least one blow had been struck for the Master. Perhaps the High Priest's posse had attracted attention, and its object had been guessed; the meaning of an alliance between Judas and the Temple authorities was obvious. Amongst others, friends of Jesus joined the party in the hope of effecting a rescue, and now when He was seized one of these drew his sword, struck at the follower of the High Priest who was in command of the party, and cut off his ear. There is no sequel to this incident, and we are not told what became of the swordsman. Probably in the prevailing excitement, while the attention of friends and foes alike was concentrated on Jesus, the blow was not noticed for the moment; and the man, finding that he was not supported, disappeared before he was recognized.

When Jesus could obtain a hearing He turned to His captors with an indignant protest.

"You have come out with swords and staves to take me, as if I were a robber; for days I have been at your disposal in the Temple as I taught, and you did not seize me."

Why had they thus sought Him at night in a lonely place, as if He were a criminal, conscious of His crime and lurking in obscure hiding-places? He had asserted His claims openly in the Temple; He had courted arrest and trial. Why did they not take Him then? He sought to

testify by His death to the truth of His teaching. Did they hope to hinder that testimony by sudden murder or secret assassination? Preoccupied with the bearing of events on His cause and His mission, He took no account of the impromptu, abortive movement to seize Him in the Temple,¹ or the prudential reasons which stood in the way of any serious attempt to arrest Him there.² But in a moment He checked Himself; the future of the Kingdom of God was not at the mercy of the petty policy of intriguing priests; the Scriptures must be fulfilled; God would work out in His own way the eternal purpose foreshadowed in His Revelation to Israel. Jesus, therefore, allowed Himself to be led away without resistance or further protest, and His disciples fled.

One adherent, however, still followed Him. It seems that the noise made by the posse on its way to Gethsemane had roused from sleep a youth who was attached to Jesus; he had gathered their errand, and without waiting to dress had hastily wrapped himself in a linen cloth and followed them. This improvised toilette was not so different from ordinary dress as it would be with us; and up till the time of the arrest no special notice had been taken of him, and he ventured to follow the party as they set out to return to Jerusalem. But now his costume and his interest in Jesus attracted attention; some one laid hold of his linen wrap, but the youth slipped out of it and escaped.

W. H. BENNETT.

SCRIBES OF THE NAZARENES.

I. RECORDS OF THE MASTER'S TEACHING.

To most readers the title "Records of the Master's Teaching" will suggest at once the Four Gospels and nothing else.

¹ Mark xii. 12.

² Mark xiv. 2.

But such records as they contain are only incidental and subordinate to the object of each author and compiler.

A Gospel is just an Announcement, whether it be vocal or written. It consists of *good* news, as the Greek and English terms suggest, because it is the Proclamation of the Sovereignty of Heaven or of Jesus Christ, to whom this is entrusted. But the main purpose of all Evangelists is to establish the proposition that Christ crucified, despite the scandalous paradox which the fact involves, was to believers God's Power and God's Wisdom. Their appeal, then, lay rather to the facts of His earthly life, regarded as parabolic prophecies of His glory, than to the Teaching which He imparted to His disciples and which formed the Law of His Church. The signs—or some of the clearest, which convinced the first generation of Christians or Nazarenes and made them such—were the proper means to this end.

When the Christian missionaries addressed themselves to Jews, they had first to discuss the academic questions—“Is the Messiah capable of suffering? Will He be the first to rise from the dead and so proclaim light to the People, and, as the prophets held, to the Gentiles also?”¹ But the Gentiles, who had no conception, true or erroneous, of a Messiah at all, had only to learn that *one that was never thought of hath worn the diadem*² and was ready to deliver them also, when their own kings *sat down upon the ground*. For both proof was needed of the assertions, that Jesus was Messiah or Deliverer, and that the expected Messiah was Jesus. Many of the signs which Jesus wrought before His disciples were omitted in the recital; but such and such were written, in order that readers *might believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God, and that believing they might have life in His name*.³

¹ Acts xxvi. 23.

² Sir. xi. 5.

³ John xx. 30 f.

The method adopted in the Fourth Gospel was also that of the first Evangelists, who used vocal preaching. Sermons of St. Peter are preserved in the first part of Acts, whose primitive conception of the Person of our Lord stamps them as unmistakeably authentic. Speaking to the Jews assembled in Jerusalem, he first dwells on the prophecy fulfilled in the Descent of the Spirit upon the Disciples and then briefly describes their Master, who, now risen, as David foretold,¹ and glorified, had poured out this, which they saw and heard. He speaks of Jesus of Nazareth, as he himself had known and come to know Him :—*A man approved of God unto you by powers and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know.*

The stress is all on the prophecy : the facts in which it is fulfilled are notorious. A written Gospel framed on this model would be little more than a string of prophecies, like those of Joel and of David—a collection of Oracles, such as tradition assigns to St. Matthew.

But when he speaks to Cornelius at Joppa, St. Peter barely refers to prophecy and gives an outline of the essential facts, though even here he is able to assume some acquaintance with the life and death of Jesus. This less meagre account shows how the oral Gospel tended necessarily to include some summary of the benefits wrought by Jesus, when its exponents addressed themselves to ignorance, partial or complete. But the crucial fact for St. Peter, as for St. Paul, is the Resurrection : of the Teaching of Jesus there is no mention, since His Presence is imminent. The first Apostles were men who could speak from personal experience of all the life of Jesus from His baptism to His assumption. They had prophecies with which to sting the guilty consciousness

¹ The Messianic interpretation of Ps. xvi. is demonstrated at length. Cf. the question "Concerning whom doth the prophet say this ? Himself or another ?" (Acts viii. 34).

of the Jews, and facts with which to pierce the indifferent ignorance of the Gentiles.¹

The preaching of St. Peter at Jerusalem and Joppa is typical of the missionary work of the original Apostles. As their sphere of work extended and the cities of the world, and not only of Israel,² lay before them, they hurried on from place to place. The Evangelist performed his function and departed : he might return to confirm his churches, but only for a moment. His work was that of the pioneer, and, if he wrote, it was only on the hearts of his converts. But, when the Lord delayed His coming and eager faith grew cold, a record of the facts or the prophecies or both was needed. So the writer of the Gospel succeeded to the speaker, conforming necessarily to the type laid down.

Irenæus³ testifies to this connexion between the vocal and written Gospel, stating it in a concrete form, such as tradition loves : “ We came to know the plan of our salvation through none others than those through whom the Gospel came to us. They proclaimed it then : afterwards, by God’s will, they delivered it to us in writing to be the foundation and pillar of our faith. . . . Matthew among the Hebrews, in their own tongue put forth a writing of the Gospel, while Peter and Paul were evangelizing in Rome and founding the Church. After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself also delivered to us in writing the preachings of Peter. And Luke, the companion of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel which Paul preached. Then John, the disciple of the Lord, who reclined upon His breast, himself also published the Gospel while living in Ephesus of Asia.” But missionary work only called for fact and prophecy. The teaching of Jesus concerned those who built up the Church and not its founders :

¹ Acts x. 34-43 ; Acts i. 22.

² Matt. x. 23.

³ *Adv. Haer.* iii. 1.

the importance of His words and still more the committal of them to writing belongs to a later stage.¹

Parables, which puzzled those who had given up all to follow the Galilean prophet, were ill-adapted to win or confirm those who had not felt the spell of His living presence. These they might expound, as they had heard Jesus expound them, in private, as need arose. But the commission given to the disciples of John Baptist was theirs: they must *go and report what they had seen and heard: that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead arise, the poor have the gospel preached to them.*² The Master's Teaching was not their main concern, who strove in speech or writing to demonstrate the reasonable necessity of faith in His Person. Not to them, the scribes of the Nazarenes, nor to the recorders of their preaching³ can we look for absorption in the Wisdom of Jesus, reputed son of Joseph of Nazareth. The words of the preacher and the endorsement of the writer dealt primarily with far other matters. Their duty was to educate their audience as they themselves had been educated, to carry them back to the historical origin of the faith, when they too were ignorant and

“knew not yet
the great event
of those so low beginnings,
from which we date our winnings.”

Their readers or hearers were enabled to witness each succes-

¹ So Eusebius, referring to the sub-Apostolic age and the contemporaries of Quadratus (98-117 A.D.), “Most of these disciples (of the apostles), smitten in soul with vehement love of philosophy by the divine word first fulfilled the saving ordinance and distributed their goods to the needy. Then setting out on their travels they performed the work of evangelists ambitious to proclaim the Christ to such as had not heard the word of the faith and to deliver the scripture of the divine gospels” (Eus. *H.E.*, iii. 37, 2).

² Luke vii. 22 f. There is here no anti-climax. The prophecy, cited in an ampler form, is fulfilled literally and spiritually. Bodily healing was necessary as evidence of the forgiveness of sins: *vide* Mark. ii. 9.

³ Luke preface.

sive act of power, which elicited the wondering question *who then is this?* Step by step their belief was raised and purified, as they contemplated the gradual manifestation of His glory, aided by the perfected insight of the eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word.

At different times and in different places other Gospels have been preferred to the Canonical Quaternion of Irenaeus.¹ Some of these Origen identified with the tentative narratives to which St. Luke refers in his preface :—

“Perhaps, then, he says, the word *attempted* contains an hidden accusation against them, who rashly and without spiritual endowment came to the recording of the Gospels. For Matthew did not *attempt*, but wrote, being moved of the Holy Spirit. So also Mark and John and Luke in like manner. The composers, however, of the Gospel inscribed : ‘According to the Egyptians and the Gospel entitled, “Of the Twelve” *attempted*.’ He goes on to mention the ‘Gospel according to Thomas’ and the ‘Gospel according to Basilides.’ ”

Jerome follows him and improves upon his statement in such a way as to justify the deduction that St. Luke wrote late in the second century A.D., to compete with the tentative Gospels of various heretics, whose date is known.

These “apocryphal” Gospels—if one may judge from extant fragments—conform to the Canonical type. At times they assume a special character and profess to deal with a part only of the Lord’s Incarnate life, which may, or may not, be described fully by their successful rivals. There are Infancy-Gospels and Passion-Gospels ; but both alike deal

¹ So (e.g.) Serapion (ob. 209 A.D.) found the Gospel according to Peter in use at Rhossus in Cilicia, and at first allowed it to be read (Eus. *H.E.* vi. 12). Cf. the currency of the Gospel according to the Hebrews among the Nazaraei of Beroea in the time of Jerome (*De viris ill.* 3 ; cf. *Com.* in *Ez.* xvi. 13, etc.).

with the acts rather than the words of Jesus and, with few exceptions, utilise *pro more* material which is accounted Canonical. The child Jesus is made to perform miracles, which are merely a feeble imitation of those recorded elsewhere, as part of His public ministry ; and, if the period chosen be the Passion, witnesses are brought forward before the Court, who describe the acts of the prisoner at the bar.

An instructive and characteristic example of the Teaching of Jesus preserved in these sources is the saying which Cassian¹ quoted, and which Clement of Alexandria found, in the Gospel according to the Egyptians.² According to this saying, full knowledge of all mysteries will be given *when ye tread upon the garment of shame, and when the two become one, and the male with the female neither male nor female*. This description of the world to come is clearly based on the Canonical saying : *cum enim a mortuis resurrexerint neque nubent neque nubentur sed sunt sicut Angeli in caelis*.³ It has been elaborated in the interests of some sect, which advocated virgin-marriage⁴ and obeyed St. Paul's saying : *Tempus breve est : reliquum est ut et qui habent uxores tamquam non habentes sint . . . præterit enim figura huius mundi*.⁵ Man is to share in the general restoration of the Universe and regain the lost innocence of Adam and Eve, who learned good and evil, and therefore clothed themselves with the garment of shame. Man and wife shall still be one, as God decreed, but a *new* (καινή)—perhaps a *common* (κοινή)—creature, as St. Paul said.⁶

There are many such "Unwritten Sayings" of Jesus whose value lies in the fact that they afford internal evidence,

¹ Floruit 170 A.D.

² Clem. Al. Strom. iii. 13 (p. 553, P). Cf. 2 "Clem." Cor. xii. 2 and the Oxyrhynchus fragment of a lost Gospel, "His disciples say unto Him, When wilt Thou be manifest to us and when shall we see Thee ? He saith, When ye shall be unclothed, and not ashamed."

³ Mark xii. 25.

⁴ Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 25 ff.

⁵ 1 Cor. vii. 29, 31.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 17 ; Gal. vi. 15.

not of their own authenticity, but of the authority of the Four Gospels and the Apostles, and that they illustrate the byways of Church History.

But the Canon of the New Testament contains also didactic writings, which are traditionally ascribed to disciples of Jesus or their associates. And, if the disciples deserved their name, we may look with confidence to them and their pupils for reflexions of the teaching of their Master, albeit *per speculum in aenigmate*. A pupil, like St. Paul, may find it necessary sometimes to cite his authority, when he speaks in the name of Jesus ; but one who belonged to "the Twelve," and any who claimed to write in the name of any one of them, spoke presumably as they had learned, directly or indirectly, from the Rabbi of Nazareth. They might adapt the Teaching to suit new circumstances ; but it remained—in oral or written tradition—the code which all Christian missionaries enforced, with or without express reference to its author.

One example will show the existence and the value of this evidence. Writing to the Church at Corinth, St. Paul, who had enjoyed a limited intercourse with St. Peter and James the brother of the Lord, is able to appeal to the supreme authority in the matter of the vexed question of Divorce :—*Is autem qui matrimonio iuncti sunt, praecipio non ego, sed Dominus, uxorem a viro non discedere*.¹ Herein St. Paul supports the Second and Third Gospels² against the first, which admits one exception³ :—*Omnis qui dimiserit uxorem suam excepta fornicationis causa facit eam moechari*. In the First Gospel the saying is given twice, once in the original context⁴ and once⁵ with the formula : *it was said to the*

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 10 f. ² Mark x. 11 f. ; Luke xvi. 18. ³ Matt. xix. 9, v. 32 f.

⁴ Cf. Mark. x. 1 ff.

⁵ Cf. Luke l.c. : The exception stultifies the absolute opposition of new and old which the formula, to be appropriate, requires.

ancients . . . but I say unto you, in both cases admitting the exception which warranted divorce. According to this report, Jesus followed the doctrine of the school of Shammai.¹ But according to the reports of the Second Gospel, which gives the attendant circumstances, and of the Third, which is content to report the new law, Jesus taught—as St. Paul testifies—that the marriage bond was indissoluble, appealing from the words of Moses to the word of God. For long enough the Christian Church followed Jesus, and the Jewish nation the conservatism of Hillel, whose school supported the view that the husband might dismiss his wife at will. The compromise of “Matthew” and Shammai was not accepted.

It is not without interest to notice that St. Paul was, like Jesus, confronted with a society, in which women were beginning to claim the same rights as men in this matter.² Indeed, at Corinth the women were to the fore—presumably because more of them had been converted to Christianity. Whereas the like action on the part of Salome, which prompted the Pharisees’ question, “was not according to the Jewish laws.”³ The revolt of a section of the Church from Jesus’ commandment is illustrated, if not described, by St. Matthew’s account of a protest made by the disciples at the time.⁴ At least, they could limit, if they dare not defy, this uncompromising condemnation of the Jewish custom.

Thus from apocryphal and apostolic records alike we return inevitably to the Gospels, as containing the Canon of the Lord’s words, by which alone, as by a touchstone, the true metal must be approved. But at the outset we have found that there are discrepancies in the Gospels,

¹ Git. ix. 10; Yer Sotah i. 1. 106.

² Cf. Mark x. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 10. ³ Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 7, 10; cf. xviii. 9, 6.

⁴ Matt. xix. 10.

which are inconsistent with the traditional account of their apostolic origin.

It is natural enough that the ordinary churchman—or ecclesiastic, as Origen named him—should regret the happier days when the traditional titles of the books were themselves a part of Scripture and Scripture was inerrant. Irenaeus' account of the four Gospels has a prescriptive right to acceptance: the Alogi who substituted Cerinthus for St. John as the author of the Fourth Gospel are forgotten; and, with them, other earlier champions of "the Gospel according to the Hebrews" and the like. Whether Hermas asserted it or not, the common view has long been that the Church rests on the foundation of the four Gospels. To dig till the real foundations are laid bare is still regarded as a work of supererogation by many. Nevertheless, the lover of true history may yet serve the Church by digging thus; for the sand which has gathered round may eat into the foundations, further with each successive flood. Apart from this danger, the winds may find it easier to blow gently on the sand, till it whirls about and hides the rock, so that men may think the house is built actually upon the sand. After all, the Church rests not on shifting traditions, not even on the four pillars which are the Gospels, but on the foundation laid once for all, which is Jesus Christ. Higher Criticism which questions the validity of tradition and compares Scripture with Scripture, is not yet branded as a heresy; and even those who attempt to practise it may share the regret of the "ecclesiastic" and dwell lingeringly upon the part of the tradition of the Church, which concerns the Gospels. But Higher Criticism being a means of attaining truth is a necessary weapon in the armoury of every "ecclesiastic." The tradition must be analysed, and the Gospels¹: *Habentes igitur talem spem, multa fiducia utimur et non sicut Moses*

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 12, iv. 6.

ponebat velamen super faciem suam ut non intenderent filii Israel in facie eius . . . quoniam Deus . . . ipse illuxit in cordibus nostris ad illuminationem scientiae claritatis Dei, in facie Christi Jesu ! ”

“Ecclesiastical history,” as Jerome knew it, gave an account of the four Gospels, which is practically an elaboration of that given by Irenaeus.¹ The section which describes the origin and date of the Fourth Gospel is as long as all the rest together. “Last, there is John, Apostle and Evangelist, whom Jesus loved much, who, reclining upon the Lord’s bosom, drank in purest streams of doctrines, and who alone deserved to hear from the cross, *Behold thy mother*. He, when he was in Asia, and when already the seeds of the heretics were sprouting—of Cerinthus, Ebion, and the rest, who deny that Christ has come in the flesh (whom he himself calls Antichrists in his Epistle and the Apostle Paul often assails)—was compelled by almost all the then bishops of Asia, and by embassies of other churches, to write in a loftier strain, and, so to speak, to burst through, not with rash but happy audacity, to the Word of God Himself.”

This tradition is compact of many elements. Some of the points are taken from the New Testament, others from extraneous sources, which can be traced back to the early part of the second century. They have been intertwined in such a way as to suggest that the vague formula *according to*, which at least admits of other interpretations, implies definite authorship ; and that the four Evangelists were quite independent of one another. According to this account, the First and Fourth Gospels contain the reminiscences of St. Matthew and St. John respectively, and the Second and Third preserve at second hand the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul. They were written with different objects and in different places. Hence, as Chrysostom

¹ Vide *supra*, page 67.

insists, their general agreement is a great proof of the truth of their narrative.¹

Traditions of this kind are now rejected with as little hesitation and consideration, as they were once received.

But in this case, at all events, one may reasonably plead for a stay of execution. The history of the formation of the Canon of New Testament Scriptures proves that Apostolic authorship, or at least Apostolic authority, was the first essential. If this tradition be simply a tissue of inventions, its origin must be sought in some unknown province of Christianity, since it is altogether inconsistent with the known tendencies of the thought of the Church. Irenaeus found—if none before him—four anonymous records of the Lord's incarnate life, in which again and again emerge four disciples—the most elect of the more elect of the elect. Surely it was natural and easy to lie in state under the name of an "Elder," and to present the Church with the records of Simon and Andrew, James and John.

It is difficult to see why the formula *according to* should have been adopted at all. Forgers, who knew their trade, spoke boldly of the "Gospel of Peter" and so forth. Yet it is so definitely the proper title of a Gospel that it has been adopted by some of the Apocryphal writings at the cost of its proper significance, which would imply that one was the Gospel as narrated (e.g.) by the Hebrews and recorded by one of their disciples.

Only in the case of the Fourth Gospel is the tradition at all in accordance with probability on the assumption that it reflects not fact but fancy. St. Matthew the publican is the last person—with the possible exception of Judas Iscariot—upon whom a reader of the Gospels would fix as a plausible father for one of them. St. Mark, according to universal testimony, was not a personal follower of the Lord. St. Luke is repre-

¹ *In Matt. Hom.* (ed. Field, p. 4).

sented as the disciple of St. Paul, who declared—according to early patristic interpretation—that he had no knowledge of Christ after the flesh, of the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth. Whatever be thought of the ascription of the Fourth Gospel to St. John and of the connexion between St. Mark and St. Peter, as regards the rest of the tradition, the conclusion is irresistible: it must be an accumulation of fragmentary facts rather than a pointless farrago of inept falsehoods.

The Fourth Gospel, which, if this part also of the tradition be credible, is the one primary Apostolic record, must be set aside for the present. The story of its origin is given by Clement of Alexandria, on the authority of the Elders, in much the same form as by Irenaeus and Jerome. But even here it must be said that no other adequate explanation of the phenomena, which it presents, has as yet been forthcoming. As regards the other three, the Synoptics who give a common view of their great subject, one has to consider the statements of Papias, which clearly underlie the ecclesiastical tradition, and to investigate the validity of the use to which they have been put.

Papias, then, who made a collection and exposition of the Lord's words, mentioned in his preface the tradition of the Elder, fragments of which relating to Mark and Matthew are preserved by Eusebius. The description of Mark is couched in terms of St. Luke's preface,¹ "Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, whatever things he remembered (*or* Peter mentioned) [these] he wrote *accurately*—not, however, *in order*—[namely] the things either said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him, but afterwards, as I said, [followed] Peter, who made his teachings as need arose. But [he wrote] not as making a composition of the Lord's words. So that Mark erred not, when thus he wrote some things as he remembered (*or* as

¹ Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 31.

Peter mentioned) them. For his one purpose was to avoid the omission of anything he heard or the falsification of anything therein."

The reference of this early tradition to *a* Gospel—if not *the* Gospel¹—according to St. Mark does not seem to be open to any serious objection. The historical sermons delivered by St. Peter abroad were faithfully recorded by the interpreter, who translated them from Aramaic into Greek for the sake of the Church at large, as formerly for the audiences who assembled to hear the Galilean preacher.

Papias seems to insist on the implications of the Elder's statement, that Mark derived his knowledge from St. Peter, whose interpreter he was, and to combine his inferences with his report. This Gospel was the work of one who received the tradition from an eye-witness, and was, therefore, as appears from the apologetic tone of Papias, depreciated. Whether its detractors made use of St. Luke's preface—as Papias certainly does—or not, their feeling is natural: the materials of the missionaries, whether they based thereon an appeal to Jews or Gentiles, might satisfy the convert, but not for long the catechumen. The wonder is, humanly speaking, that the Gospel, which is admittedly incomplete and lacking in order, should survive in any form. Few of its few distinctive features have left any trace in the meagre remnant of the occasional writings belonging to the sub-Apostolic age. The early Gnostics used it in the interests of their theory, which separated Jesus from Christ and declared that Christ was incapable of suffering and that Jesus suffered.² Accordingly, it was copied so little that all our texts are derived from one defective copy, which lacked the original ending. To this fact is probably due the nickname of St. Mark, ὁ κολοβο-δάκτυλος ("He with the mutilated finger"). It is not clear whether the present Second Gospel

¹ So Iren. iii. 106, etc.

² Iren. iii. 11. 10 (ed. Harvey, vol. ii. p. 46).

contains or actually constitutes the narrative of St. Mark, to which Papias refers. The phantom of an original Mark has been laid by authority,¹ but continues still to haunt some of the most diligent students of the problem. But, speaking generally, the internal evidence of the extant Gospel according to St. Mark, corresponds to the tradition preserved by Papias. It is a Gospel which describes Jesus of Nazareth, the man commended by God to the Jews by powers and wonders and signs which God wrought through him. It does not reflect the settled conviction, that this Jesus was all the while the Son of God ; but preserves, with extraordinary fidelity, the chequered growth of the belief that He was *aut Deus aut non bonus*. The abrupt conclusion is typical of the whole record. The women, who had ministered to Jesus out of their substance during His wanderings, visit His grave and are charged by its angelic custodian with the message : *He was raised and precedeth you into Galilee : And going forth they fled from the tomb, for trembling and ecstasy possessed them. And they told no one anything, for they were afraid.*

Of Matthew, Papias or his informant said : "Matthew composed the Dominical Oracles in the Hebrew tongue and each one interpreted them as he was able." There are difficulties in the way of acceptance of this statement, as referring to the origin of the first of the present four Gospels. Rather, it supplies an explanation of the origin of its traditional title. The Dominical Oracles are the oracles belonging to (or concerned with) the Lord—Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, in fact, which a Christian would describe as "the things concerning Jesus." A collection or composition of these was, and is, the proper material of a

¹ Professor Swete says (*St. Mark*, p. lviii. note) : "The present writer has risen from his study of the Gospel with a strong sense of the unity of the work and can echo the *requiescat Urmarkus* which ends a recent discussion."

missionary to the Jews, such as Matthew.¹ Such a collection is a distinctive feature of the First Gospel : scattered as they are, the prophecies introduced by the formula *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken* are obviously derived from one source, and are the Logia of Matthew to which Papias refers. The origin of the remainder of the First Gospel must be left to practitioners of the "Higher Criticism."

With regard to the Fourth Gospel, Papias is reported to have used its testimonies. For the Third no statement of his is handed down. It is clear that he was acquainted with St. Luke's preface, and probably took the same view of Gospels which consisted only of prophecies or of facts. To judge from the preface of his Expositions of the Lord's words, at any rate, he seems to have resolved to do what St. Luke did. Like St. Luke he had in view catechumens, who as such had been instructed in the new morality. The recital of facts effected conversion : the convert was catechized in the moral teaching—*Jesus says . . .* But the catechist was naturally engrossed in the conclusions at which Jesus or His apostles had arrived : the catechumen had no assurance of certainty, as he passed from Jesus the Wonder-worker to contemplate Christ the Lawgiver. For St. Luke facts were of value as well as the teaching, and in his Gospel and the sequel he presented an historical narrative of the foundation of the Christian Church as the best means of confirming the neophyte. Papias' work, on the other hand, was to expound the Lord's sayings, and with this end in view he sought out—as, doubtless, St. Luke did—all independent evidence available apart from the books :—

"Nor will I hesitate also to combine with the interpretations for thy benefit whatever I well learned from the elders and well remembered, being assured of their truth. For I did not, like the many, take pleasure in the much-speakers but in teachers of the truth ; nor in the remembrancers of alien commandments, but the remembrancers

¹ The tradition that the ex-taxgatherer devoted himself to work among the Jews is sufficiently arduous and lacking in plausibility to be credible.

of those which were given to faith from the Lord and proceeded from the truth itself. But if also anywhere there came one who had followed the elders, I was wont to enquire of the words of the elders :— what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip—or what Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples, and the things which Aristion and the Elder John, the Lord's disciples, say. For I supposed that things taken from books would not profit me so much as those coming from a living and abiding voice."

The repositories of the Apostolic tradition could answer the new questions which the records left untouched.

Now Augustine, the contemporary of Jerome, inferred, from the close resemblance of the Second to the First Gospel, that the former was an abbreviation of the latter. This excursion into the Higher Criticism of the Gospels he supports by showing the mystical significance of the fact. "He who undertook to describe the royal character of Christ had a comrade, who followed his steps. Luke, on the other hand, whose attention was taken up with the priesthood of Christ, had none to abbreviate his narrative ; for the priest entered alone into the sanctuary."

This precedent may be cited—if need be—in defence of such studies as aim at the discovery of the sources which lie behind the four Gospels in their present form. Their agreement is not necessarily a proof of their respective credibility, but often merely evidence of their mutual dependence or common indebtedness to some pre-existing tradition.

There appears to be a growing consensus of opinion among those who have followed up the methods of Augustine, to the general effect that the First, Second and Third Gospels rest for the most part on two primitive documents or traditions. The former is generally considered to be identical with, or to be contained in, the Gospel according to St. Mark : the latter is defined as the matter common to the other two Gospels, which is not also preserved by St. Mark.

The former contains comparatively little of the Master's Teaching, and yet enough to suggest that later compilers were apt to develop and modify what they report.

There is a saying connected with the accusation that Jesus cast out devils by the aid of Bezebul, which has been so treated in the First and Third Gospels as to define a new and, contrary to expectation, a venial sin. The narrative of the Second Gospel is perfectly natural : the argument of Jesus' commentary on the charge proceeds to its proper and inevitable conclusion :—*Verily I say unto you, that all things shall be forgiven to the sons of men—the sins and the blasphemies whatsoever they blaspheme : but whosoever blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, he hath not forgiveness for ever, but is guilty of the eternal sin.* The Evangelist adds the explanation :—*because they said “ he hath an unclean spirit.”*¹ In the First Gospel the historical setting of the saying is preserved, but supplemented by the secondary and isolated form, which alone is given by St. Luke.

| PRIMARY FORM, with narrative. | | SECONDARY FORM, isolated saying. | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Mark iii. 28. Verily I say unto you | {Matt. xii. 31. Therefore I say unto you | Matt. xii. 32. | Luke xii. 10. |
| all things shall be forgiven to the sons of men—the sins and the blasphemies whatsoever they blaspheme. | every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to men | and whosoever say a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him | and every one who shall say a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him. |
| But whosoever blaspheme against the Holy Spirit, he hath not forgiveness for ever, but is guilty of eternal sin. | but the blasphemy of the Spirit shall not be forgiven. | but whosoever speak against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world (age) nor in the future. | but to him that blasphemed against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven. |

¹ Mark iii. 28-30.

The conjunction of the primary and secondary forms of the saying in the First Gospel has produced a shortening of the former, which is followed in the secondary form as given by St. Luke : there is, however, other evidence which supports the reference to *the age* as part of the original. The only difference between the two reports consists in the substitution of *the Son of Man* for *the sons of men* and the simple transposition, by which it becomes dependent on *blasphemy* (or its equivalents) and no longer on *shall be forgiven*. So, a specious antithesis is secured between the two members of the saying ; and the forgiveness promised is limited to one particular example—blasphemy against the Son of Man—of *all the sins and blasphemies whatsoever men blaspheme*.

But the primary form suits the context and arises out of it : its first member does not assert that all sins—with one exception—will be forgiven, but stands in emphatic contrast to the second—*though all (other) sins be forgiven, yet the blasphemer of the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven*.¹ Sins against man were only forgiven on condition of confession and reparation ; but here is no question of that discrimination between the persons offended, which, indeed, Jesus discouraged in His disciples. To say *Jesus has an unclean spirit* is more obviously a blasphemy against the Son of Man than a sin against the Holy Spirit. It is necessary to search for an adequate motive to explain this adaptation of the condemnation.

The narrative is concerned exclusively with the encounter between Jesus and the scribes, who came down from Jerusalem.² Standing among the crowds, who were wondering at the great Exorcist,³ they attempted to undermine His

¹ The law is summarized in love of God and love of one's neighbour ; the latter is the only visible proof of the former.

² Mark iii. 22.

³ Cf. Luke xi. 14 f.

popularity by explaining that His power was not from Jehovah, as the Evangelists assert, but from His ally—Beezebul. At first Jesus meets them on their own ground with argument and a parable : finally He denounces them as sinners past hope of pardon. It is hardly conceivable that any Christian teacher in the first century should wish to spare the Scribes, their typical enemies, and to explain, against the gloss of St. Mark,¹ that they did not really sin against the light, having none.

Nevertheless the context as given in the primitive narrative supplies the motive for the mitigation of this stern sentence. Before the Scribes appear on the scene it stands written, *and he comes home and again a crowd comes together, so that they could not even eat bread. And having heard his family came out to take charge of him, for they said, "He is beside himself."*² And after the episode is closed, all three Synoptists record the message sent by His mother and brethren and the implied repudiation of their claim upon Him :—*and he answered and saith to them, Who is my mother and brethren ? And looking round on those who were sitting round him in a circle, he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren ! Whosoever do the will of God is my brother and sister and mother.* Only the other primitive record of the Fourth Gospel affords any parallel to this description of the unbelief of the Lord's homefolk ; and there,³ only His brethren are mentioned by the disciple, who received Mary as his own mother.

The repudiation might be explained as in no way reflecting upon their character, but rather showing that the Master had made the sacrifices which He demanded of His disciples. But the mention of their arrival before or with the Scribes,

¹ Mark iii. 20. Their "judicial blindness" might be held to preclude unpardonable sin ; but without conversion there is no forgiveness (ib. iv. 12).

² Mark iii. 19–21.

³ John vii. 1–8 ; cf. ii. 4.

and its motive, was an obvious stumbling-block to Christians, who revered at any rate James, the brother of the Lord, first bishop of Jerusalem. The First and Third Gospels accordingly omit the notice, which precedes this incident ; and Christian catechesis embodied in the " Western Text " gives a dexterous turn to the possibly ambiguous Greek, reading, *and when the scribes and the rest heard they came out to seize him, for they were saying he maddeneth them.*

But the danger latent in the Marcan narrative is not merely that a simple reader might be scandalized by the errand of the mother and brethren of Jesus. He would be ready enough to set against it St. James' repentance of his unbelief and the sign of his forgiveness recorded in tradition. So St. James, at any rate, might be acquitted as having atoned for this sin by the austere piety of his later life, and by the martyrdom which crowned it. But as the text stands in St. Mark, His family were saying, *He is mad*, and the Scribes, *He hath Bezebul* : surely these are but different ways of stating the same conclusion. His family, then, must lie under the same condemnation—which is intolerable. Therefore, before the simple expedient of omission or of alteration of the preliminary mention of His family was adopted, advantage was taken of the difference of phrase, and the sentence was adapted to support the distinction between the blasphemy of His family—against the Son of Man—and that of the Scribes—against the Holy Spirit.

And before this the evidence suggests that the reference to eternal sin and impossibility of forgiveness had been dropped, as in the secondary form of the First and Third Gospels. The accumulation of successive and mutually exclusive modifications of the original has at least given scope to the subtle ingenuity of expositors. But, even when later piety had removed all trace of the complicity of Jesus' mother and brethren in the errand of the Scribes, there were others, who were

satisfied that the only verdict, of which even fuller evidence admitted, was *Jesus accursed*; and afterwards were fain to win a pardon for the blasphemy. So the secondary form was kept side by side with the primary in order that nothing and no one be lost. The Evangelists who spoke and wrote had the mind of Christ and trusted in the promise, "the Paraclete . . . shall teach you all things, and remind you of all things which I said to you." The words of Christ being spirit and life, tended to take to themselves a body wherever they were deposited, to adapt themselves to their environment and to grow.

This investigation, like the examination of the pronouncement upon the question of Divorce, raises a serious question: If even the Synoptists differ among themselves, is the touchstone—or the treasury of common repute, or its key—useless? It is no new problem.

Origen recognizes the discrepancies between the narratives of the four Evangelists, which, perhaps, like the contradictions of the Old Testament and the New, furnished the starting-point of the Gnostic theory of varying degrees of inspiration. The tenth volume of his Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John¹ begins at the point where Jesus went down to Capernaum. He compares at once the statements of the Synoptists:—"The other three who wrote Gospels say that, after the Lord's struggle with the devil, he retired into Galilee. But Matthew and Luke say that, having been first in Nazareth, He deserted that place and came and dwelt in Capernaum. Moreover, Matthew and Mark actually state a cause for His retirement thence: He had heard that John was delivered up."

After quoting the passages² concerned, Origen draws the inference:—"The truth concerning these things must lie in

¹ John ii. 12; cf. iii. 23 f.

² Matt. iv. 11-15, 17; Mark i. 13 ff., 21; Luke iv. 13-16, 31.

the spiritual meaning, or, if the discrepancy be not resolved, we must give up the faith concerning the Gospels as not truly nor by a Divine spirit written or accurately remembered." The Synoptic and Johannine accounts cannot both be true, and there are many other cases in which a careful critic will find a lack of agreement in respect of the history.

Origen's solution was the method of mystical interpretation which apparently needed much eloquence, as well as emphasis on the only—and impossible—alternative, to commend it. The spiritual teaching of Scripture which is thus ascertained was, he says, the chief object which the Evangelists kept before them. "When it was possible, they were true to spirit and fact ; but, when both spiritual and literal truth could not be preserved, they preferred the spiritual to the literal. Hence often the spiritual truth is preserved, as one might say, in the bodily or literal lie."¹

His application of the method to this particular difficulty contains a golden sentence: "John Baptist, in his namesake's Gospel, survives for long without being cast into prison. But in Matthew he is delivered up into prison almost during the temptation of Jesus: wherefore,² also, Jesus retires into Galilee, avoiding imprisonment. But in John, the Baptist is not found delivered into prison at all. *But who is so wise and sufficient for so much as to learn all Jesus from the four Evangelists and to be able³ to understand each one separately and to see all His visitations and words and deeds in each place?* After the merry-making at Cana Jesus goes to Capernaum, the Field of Consolation, to console His companions and not the people there."⁴

Elsewhere, Origen asserts that the Gospels are as full of absurdities as the Pentateuch⁵: as when the devil is said

¹ Orig. in Joh. tom. x. 5. ² δι' ὃ for δι' ὅν. ³ χωρηῆσαι.

⁴ ib. 8.

⁵ *De Principiis*, iv. (*Philocalia*, c. i.).

to have led Jesus into an high mountain that he might show Him thence all the kingdoms of the earth and their glory. There are precepts in the Gospels, too, which are as preposterous as any of the Mosaic Law : as for example, *salute no one by the way*,¹ and, again, the description of a man who is said to be smitten on the *right* cheek, whereas any normal person using his right hand hits the left cheek.²

So, in his general method of exegesis, Origen found a ready answer to those who urged that the Scriptures were mutually contradictory : it was no expedient extemporized to meet a particular need. The stumbling-blocks of Scripture force us to look for something diviner than the letter, which is often irrational and impossible.

Discrepancies in matters of fact, like the date of the imprisonment of John Baptist, were naturally the first to attract the notice of the critical inquirer. Different versions of the words of the Lord were readily accepted as complementary. But divergences in the reports of identical sayings must be recognized—and welcomed—as clues which lead up to the original. The good coin has often been restamped by an approved banker, before it was put into circulation. “By means of such various—not contrary—expressions we learn a most useful and very necessary lesson, that we ought to look for nothing in the words of each Evangelist, save the meaning which the words ought to serve ; that no one lies, if he say in other words what the speaker meant . . . Not in words only, but in all other symbols of minds, only the mind itself must be sought after.”³

The meaning set upon the teaching of the Master, of which Augustine here speaks, varied according to the needs

¹ Luke x. 4.

² Matt. v. 39.

³ Aug. *de Consensu Evv.*, ii. 67 : referring to the different accounts of the raising of Jairus' daughter.

or insight of the Scribes : *there are diversities of ministries*, even in the ministry of the Word, *and the same Lord*. As disciples, they had always found hard sayings therein, which baffled their growing intelligence : as Scribes taught of God, they tended naturally to add, or even substitute for the actual words, the meaning, as they conceived it, speaking as and only what their disciples also were able to contain. So they brought forth new things and old ; and the streams of tradition, which meet in the fourfold Gospel, received gradually their colour and their course. Additions for the purpose of elucidation of word or work are not necessarily fictions, as Origen is ready to admit : “ Scripture,” he says, “ interwove with the history what did not happen now little, now much, now things possible and now things impossible.” But some element of truth must be recognized in the view, which he advocated in common with the Gnostics :—“ that the Apostles admixed things belonging to the Law with the Saviour’s words ; and not only the Apostles, but also the Lord Himself spoke now from the Demiurge, now from the Intermediate, and now from the Supreme.”¹ The time for plain speech to those outside was come,² when Jesus rose from the dead.

In this work and that word the glory of grace and truth lurked obscure. Prophecy must illuminate fact till the speaker be revealed—*all Jesus*—as to those who fled despairing to Emmaus. Thus and thus is He proved very Man as thus and thus He was proved to be very God. Scriptural writers have pieced the evidence together.

All things are double one against another ;
and He did nothing imperfect :
One thing establisheth the good of another ;
and who shall be filled with beholding His glory ?

¹ Iren. *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 2, 2 ; cf. i. 7, 3. The letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora shows that Irenaeus gives a fair account of the Gnostic view.

² Cf. Mark viii. 31 with iv. 11.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

IN the *Journal* of the American Oriental Society (vol. xxvi. 1906, pp. 317 f.), Prof. G. F. Moore discusses Matthew xxiii. 35 f. and xxviii. 1 in the light of the Talmud. In opposition to Wellhausen (so Nestle, in *Zeitschrift für d. neutest. Wiss.*, 1905, 198 f.), he regards the Zechariah of the former passage as very probably the son of Jehoiada. His "death and its bloody expiation were the subject of a legend whose popularity is attested by the frequency with which it is repeated in Jewish sources ; in this literature it is, in fact, the typical murder of a prophet." Though the literature in question is much later than the New Testament, the legend, a Midrash on 2 Chronicles xxiv. 19-25, may well be older than the Christian era. The last words of the dying prophet were, "Yahwè, see and require it," and the judgment of God on Jerusalem showed how the prophet's blood was required at the hands of the Jews. Like Abel's, his blood cried from the ground for vengeance. The Lucan phrase, *the blood of Zechariah*, probably was expanded by a later editor or scribe into the Matthean form which adds *son of Barachias*, thereby confusing the Old Testament prophet with the hero of the Midrash.

Schmiedel's discovery of a discrepancy of half a day between Matthew xxviii. 1 and Mark xvi. 1-2 (*Encyclop. Biblica*, iv. 4041 f.) is rejected, on the ground that the words ὁ ψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων are the literal rendering of a Hebrew or Aramaic source in which במוצאי שבת (Heb.) or באפוקי שבתא (Aram.) had their usual idiomatic sense of a time after the end of the Sabbath, sometimes Saturday night in general or even the whole of Sunday (i.e. = ὁ ψὲ δὲ σαββάτων). The second part

of the Greek phrase also goes back to the Jewish idiom, נְבֵהִי or אֵוֶר designating "the night whose morning would bring in the following day." Thus, when the Greek words are taken as reproducing literally Jewish divisions of time, any discrepancy between Matthew and the other Gospels on this point vanishes. All state that the women went to the tomb by night.

In his large volume, *der Paulinismus u. die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenzeitigen Verhältniss untersucht* (1904), Resch attempts, amid other things, to show that Paul's use of the Logia is proved by the dependence of 1 Corinthians vii. 10–11 on Mark x. 11, and of 1 Thessalonians iv. 15 f. ("this I say unto you by a word of the Lord," etc.) on Mark xiii. 26–27. Professor Kirsopp Lake, in the *American Journal of Theology* (Jan. 1906, pp. 107 f.), examines both of these instances, only to find that they break down as proof of the alleged relationship, though they suggest the Apostle's use of some smaller and less formal collection of sayings (so Heinrici). In 1 Corinthians vii. 10 f. Paul introduces his decision with the words παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος (contrast 6 and 25), and the only extant evangelic logion which discusses the divorce or desertion of a husband by a wife is preserved in Mark x. 10–12, where Resch adopts the teaching of Codex Bezae, εἰὰν γυνὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾷται. Furthermore, "*Syr. Sin.* and *Farn.* 1 place the case of the wife before that of the husband, just as Paul does." In 1 Thessalonians iv. 15 f., though the characteristic features of Mark xiii. 26 f. are too different to make it a probable source, yet some collection of λόγοι may be quoted from. "I think it more likely that Mark xiii. 20 f. is in itself an early attempt to expound some genuine saying, perhaps the same as that implied in 1 Thessalonians iv. 15, by an exegesis, inspired by Jewish

apocalyptic literature, parts of which are imbedded in the present text." This accords with the view of Oscar Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus*, E. Tr. pp. 9-10), who thinks it extremely probable that Jesus spoke of "the resurrection of his friends, in some such words as those of 1 Thessalonians iv. 16 f."

Wrede's pamphlet against the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, ix. 2) is the subject of a somewhat belated review by Wernle in the *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1905, pp. 347-352). The collection of parallel matter which, it is urged by Wrede, render impossible the composition of 2 Thessalonians by the author of 1 Thessalonians, are sifted and scrutinized carefully by the reviewer. Thus II. iii. 8=I. ii. 9 loses much of its force when we recollect that ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ is a common expression of Paul himself (2 Cor. xi. 37), as is νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργάζεσθαι. The coincidence between II. ii. 1 and I. v. 12 proves little or nothing, since the content of ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί is different, while ἐρωτᾶν itself (cf. Phil. iv. 3, etc.) is frequently employed in exhortation. The parallel between II. i. 4 and I. i. 3 is discounted by the fact that ὑπομονή stands in a different construction and connexion in these passages, and, upon the whole, the case against the authenticity cannot be said to have been proved on the mere question of the literary relationship between the two epistles (p. 349). Proceeding to discuss Wrede's reconstruction of the situation presupposed by the epistle, Wernle protests that insufficient account is taken in many quarters of the difference between pseudonymous epistles being written to individuals (e.g. the Pastorals) and similar epistles to churches—the latter procedure involving difficulties which are too frequently ignored by historical critics. The definite argument in favour of a later date are one by one

weighed and found wanting in cogency. In short, while the authenticity of the Epistle cannot be said to be proved, everything becomes clear and intelligible "if 2 Thessalonians was actually written not long after 1 Thessalonians, forty or fifty years later, it is an enigma." Wernle thus comes into line, at this point, with Clemen, who also accepts, in his life of Paul (i. p. 139), the Epistle as authentic.

In a recent essay in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1905, iv. pp. 521-565), Dr. Wilhelm Soltau has developed afresh the older theory of H. J. Holtzmann upon the literary relations between Ephesians and Colossians. It is not enough, he sees, to regard the former Epistle as a sub-Pauline variation upon Colossians, nor can the latter Epistle, even on the hypothesis that Paul wrote it, be accepted as extant in its original form. Professor Soltau detects two classes of interpolation in Colossians, one series being due to the more or less accidental intrusion of glosses from the margin into the text, the other proceeding from the pen of a transcriber who introduced a number of passages from Ephesians. Thus, while the original "Colossians" (Col. A) consisted substantially of i. 1-13, ii. 1-7, 8-19, ii. 20-iii. 4, iv. 10-18, our canonical "Ephesians" is based upon the original Epistle to the Laodiceans, which is to be found practically in Col. B=Colossians i. 21-29 (cf. 1 Pet. i. 5-9 f., Eph. iv. 18, ii. 16), iii. 5-11, 12-17, 18-iv. 4, iv. 7-10. This latter Epistle was drawn upon by the writer who interpolated the original "Colossians" into its canonical form, and it also afforded a subsequent Paulinist of the second century a nucleus for composing our canonical "Ephesians." This theory, it is claimed, accounts satisfactorily for the disappearance of the Epistle to Laodicea, since, like the Logia of Matthew, once incorporated in a larger writing, it would no longer possess the same *raison d'être*. The object of the

original "Colossians" letter (i.e. minus i. 6, 9, 10*b*, 11*a*, 14–20, 28, ii. 2*a*, 9, 13, 15, 19, all interpolations from "Ephesians"; together with insertions in i. 12*b*, 24*b*, 25*a*, ii. 7*a*, 11*b*, 22–23) is to refute Philonic influences, as in Philonism the angel cult and legalism were combined. Philonism is the *philosophy* of Colossians ii. 8 (pp. 539 f.), and the polemic is directed against the contemporary Alexandrian philosophy of Judaism.

These Epistles are edited, on much less radical lines, by Paul Ewald in Zahn's *Commentary* (vol. x., 1905), who decides for Rome as the place of their composition (pp. 2–7). In Ephesians i. 1, for the obscure τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν . . . καὶ πιστοῖς, Dr. Ewald still proposes, as he did formerly (*Neue Kirch. Zeitschrift*, 1904, pp. 560 f.), to read τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ὡσιν . . . κ. π. The origin of the words *in Ephesus* is ascribed to the fact that the Epistle originally was in the possession of that church. As a general circular epistle, designed for Laodicea and the Asiatic churches (pp. 17 f.), it naturally would be specially connected with the leading city and church of the province. Ephesians he is inclined to date prior to Colossians (pp. 20–25).

Bachmann's edition of the first Corinthian Epistle, in the same series (vol. vii. 1905), discusses its date in an appendix (pp. 480 f.), which controverts the usual idea that the Epistle was written *towards the close* of Paul's three years at Ephesus (xvi. 8). The opening for fresh work, it is held, must have led to more than a couple of months' residence, and the ἐθνηριομάχησα of xv. 32 (cf. xvi. 9) shows that Paul is looking back on the first, and not on the second, part of his story at Ephesus (Acts xix. 9–20). It is in the vicinity of the period described in Acts xix. 9 f., that is, during the spring of 56 A.D., that the Epistle was composed; cf. *the*

many adversaries with verse 9, the *fighting with beasts* with verse 19, the *open door* with verse 11 f. The two most recent English editors of the Epistle also placed it in the spring either of 55 (so Mr. Goudge, in the *Westminster Commentaries*), or of 56 (so Professor Findlay, in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*).

The most recent edition of the Catholic Epistles, by the Roman Catholic scholar, Th. Calmes (Paris, 1905, pp. 242), adds little or nothing to previous editions constructed upon the most rigid traditional lines. But an ingenious hypothesis with regard to 2 Peter has been promulgated by another scholar of the same communion. Attempts have been often made, from Grotius to Köhl, to find interpolated matter in 2 Peter, but P. Ladeuze, of Louvain, in a recent study (*Revue Biblique*, 1905, pp. 543-552), while refusing to regard ii. 1-iii. 2 as an interpolation from Jude (Köhl) or to separate chapters ii. and iii., proposes the novel idea that iii. 1-16 ought to be immediately after ii. 3a, in order to avoid certain roughnesses and dislocations in the canonical form of the text. In the latter, it is held, ii. 1-3a announce prophetically the appearance of *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι* among the faithful, whereas 3b assumes their presence at the moment. Similarly iii. 1-3 refer to the future, and when they are set side by side with ii. 1-3a, the passage from the future to the present (iii. 4 f.) becomes less violent, the author writing, in prophetic fashion, of a present crisis. The opening of the Epistle thus (i. 5 f.) contains a positive exhortation to the Christian life, in view of the imminent advent (iii. 11-15). Then comes the negative section (iii. 16, ii. 3b-22), warning the faithful against the seductions and doom of errorists. In this way, Ladeuze argues, the connexion between ii. 3a and iii. 1 is preserved (the writer aiming to correct and meet the seductive arguments of the errorists), ii. 3b fits in with

iii. 16 (οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν νυστάζει following αἱ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν . . . πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν), and iii. 17 forms the natural conclusion of ii. 20–22. Thus, too, the author is acquitted of having gone off into the long digression of chapter ii., forgetting the primary question of the Advent with which he had started. The transposition must have been accidental, due perhaps to some copyist who was interrupted at ii. 3a, and, on resuming his work, inadvertently began with ii. 3b. Whereupon, discovering his mistake, he simply added the omitted passage at the end, calling attention to the error by a note or mark on the margin, which afterwards was lost sight of. This implies that the archetype was in roll form. If it was in cover form, the transposition of a leaf would be equally simple, and in a palimpsest of the eighth or ninth century, Ladeuze points out, ii. 3b–22 occupies seventy-five lines, while iii. 1–16 is almost equal to it (seventy-two lines).

The Domitianic date of the Apocalypse receives fresh corroboration from the researches of Herr Linsenmayer on *Die Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den römischen Staat bis zum Tode des Kaisers Julian* (1905). The Munich scholar, like Görres, shows how the general friendliness of Vespasian and Titus towards Christians renders any date for the Apocalypse in their reigns well nigh impossible (pp. 66 f.). A comparison study of the inner side of the Imperial policy was recently presented by the well known novelist, Mr. F. Marion Crawford, in his *Rulers of the South* (1901, vol. i. 360 f.), but his sensible pages hardly won adequate notice from students of the New Testament. He pointed out how the primitive martyrs were “the victims not only of devotion to their own faith, as well as of political necessity, but of the passions that individually animated their unscrupulous

judges. It may well be doubted whether the most enlightened government would tolerate the existence of a secret organization of such dimensions and importance as were attained by Christianity in the early centuries of the empire, if that organization manifested its beliefs by refusing to conform with some generally accepted regulation or practice. Justice, therefore, requires that, without at all depreciating the merit of those early Christians who suffered themselves to be torn to pieces and tortured for the true faith, we should also admit that the government which inflicted such sufferings was acting, to the best of its knowledge, for the preservation of law and order."

In the *Journal* of the American Oriental Society (vol. xxvi. 1906, pp. 315 f.), Professor G. F. Moore observes that the theory connecting the *number of the Beast* in Revelation xiii. 18 with Caligula gains strength from the fact that Caligula in Hebrew (Gaskalgas = גסקלגס קסר) is equivalent, in gematria, to 616 ($3 + 60 + 100 + 30 + 3 + 60$, $100 + 6 + 200$). Gunkel's theory of תהום קדמוניה involves a grammatical error, on the other hand, for the "feminine ending is not used in adjectives of this type," and there is no warrant for omitting the article. Besides, "primal" is not, as Gunkel sweepingly asserts, a standing attribute of mysterious significance in Jewish writings.

JAMES MOFFATT.

SYNOPTIC STUDIES.

I. THE BEATITUDES.

THE problem of problems in the synoptic question is the form and contents of the lost Aramaic source which Papias assigns to the Apostle Matthew. Does the First or the Third Gospel preserve it more faithfully? Did the Evangelists study it in Aramaic or in Greek; and if in Greek, had they generally identical translations before them? The studies which follow will have these questions continually in view, though the endeavour to trace the original form of the words of Jesus will only be subsidiary to the endeavour to grasp their essential meaning.

We start with some questions connected with the Sermon on the Mount. It may be as well to say at the outset that this discourse seems to me preserved most closely in Luke vi.: the elements in Matthew v.-vii. which Luke places in other contexts were not part of the Sermon as it stood in Q—we will adopt this convenient symbol for the non-Marcian source. I may add my own further conviction that where Matthew¹ and Luke differ in their report it is nearly always the former who has been introducing variation, for sundry motives, which will appear as we go on.

In examining the Beatitudes, we may begin with the literary form. It seems almost misleading to use the word "literary" in connexion with such fresh and spontaneous utterances as the words of Jesus. But the Hebrew mind

¹ I mean our First Gospel, which probably is "according to Matthew" because it is so largely "according to Q."

expressed itself in parallelism by a sort of necessity whenever thought was highly charged with feeling; and if the quintessence of "literature" is simply the best things said in the best way, we can use the term here with small likelihood of being contradicted. We see at once that in Luke vi. 20-26 there is parallelism continuously carried out: each blessing answers exactly to its woe. But a glance at Matthew v. 3-12 shows how much more elaborate is the form. There are eight Beatitudes, followed by a special application of the last; and the eighth lies very near the first. The Kingdom of Heaven is the subject of the Sermon as a whole, and the Beatitudes begin and leave off upon the same appropriate note. They form accordingly when taken together a composition of the same order as the eighth Psalm—an initial declaration followed by a development, returning upon itself with significant emphasis at the close. That this highly artistic arrangement is due to the Evangelist rather than to his source is made probable by comparing the concluding similitude of the Sermon as it appears in the two Gospels. We may, perhaps, see the same elaboration of parallelism in the Oxyrhynchus Logia. Compare with their canonical parallels the following sayings:—

I. no. 6. A prophet is not accepted in his own country;
nor doth a physician work cures on them that know him.

I. no. 7. A city built on the top of a high hill,
and established,
can neither fall
nor be hid.

II. no. 4. For there is nothing hid which will not become
 manifest,
 and *buried* which will not [be raised ?].

The parallelism which distinguishes all these new Logia is not without importance as enhancing the probability of a genuine basis for them; but it must be acknowledged as

highly likely that they have passed through a medium which has intensified this.

We may now take the Beatitudes in Matthew's order one by one.

1. *Happy the poor in their spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.*

In Luke—

Happy ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.

Professor Burkitt points out that the presumed Aramaic original of this *ὅτι* is ambiguous: it could be equally rendered "that they". . . or "who will . . ." The fact that the two Evangelists translate alike by *ὅτι* goes to swell the evidence in favour of a common Greek source. The first Beatitude brings us into the heart of our problem, and what we have to say here may be repeated, *mutatis mutandis*, for the two other sayings in which Luke and Matthew come into contrast. Did Matthew insert *τῷ πνεύματι*, which alters the whole content of the saying; or was it in the source, and did Luke cut it out? A considerable element in our answer is derived from the cumulative effect of studying other similar cases; and if I seem to start with a bias in favour of Luke's originality, it is only fair to note how the bias grew. Here, at any rate, there are arguments independent of other synoptic passages. The paradoxical form of the Lucan Beatitudes speaks strongly for them. The world "counts the proud happy" (Mal. iii. 15—LXX. *μακαρίζομεν*), and "dishonours the poor man" (Jas. ii. 6). In the kingdom of God this judgement is reversed. It is not, of course, that the poor are beatified as such—an allowance of common sense is assumed in the hearers of these pithy paradoxes. The history of the idea needs to be borne in mind. Time was when the flocks and herds of an Abraham or a Job were regarded as the outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual

grace. But the experience of the church-nation after the exile changed all this. "Forget not the congregation of Thy poor" was the recurrent cry of the pious, who had only too much reason to make the rich all but synonymous with the wicked (Isa. liii. 9). And so when "Thy poor" of the Psalmist is taken up in the Master's address to His disciples, we are in no danger of assuming that the blessing on "you poor" could be readdressed to the drunken casual of to-day. The Lucan form, alike in the absence of $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\piνεύματι$ and in the presence of the corresponding Woe, is supported by James, whose saturation in the ideas of the Sermon on the Mount is the one sufficient argument for regarding his Epistle as the work of a Christian Jew. When James says (ii. 5) "Did not God choose out for Himself the poor as to this world as rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to them that love Him?" we cannot overlook the direct allusion to our Beatitude. And it must have been in the Lucan form: note the $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omega$ (dative of "person judging," or possibly not differing much from the $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$ $\pi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ of Luke xii. 21) as contrasted with the locative $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\piνεύματι$ of Matthew. Nor is this the only allusion in the Epistle. The opening of chapter v. is entirely in the spirit of the Woe here. And in i. 9, 10 we have the element which justifies Matthew's interpretative insertion. "Let the humble brother glory in his exaltation, and the rich (brother) in his humiliation." The rich man who, by the grace of Omnipotence, has achieved what is harder than for the camel to pass through the needle's eye, may well glory in that sublime levelling process which enables the millionaire to share with the pauper the treasures of Heaven. A further note of Lucan originality may be seen in the characteristic $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ of the Woe—"Alas for you rich, for you have received your consolation." It is the technical word in receipts—see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 229,

or any page of the second volume of Wilcken's *Ostraka*—and indicates that all that is due has been paid, there is no more to come. The coincidence with Matthew vi. 2, 5, 16 is conclusive. The blessing and the woe together recall many other passages in which the theodicy reverses the conditions of the world: so Isaiah lxv. 13, 14; Luke i. 52, 53; John xvi. 20, and especially Luke xvi. 25.

The point made above from Luke's use of the second person—the originality of which is supported by its appearance in Matthew v. 11, 12—is not affected by its being found in the Woes as well. The “disciples” to whom our Lord was speaking included men of all kinds, and all degrees of attachment to His person. He may well have visualised the rich men really or ideally before Him, just as James visualises Sir Gorgius Goldring (ii. 2) stalking into the Christian “synagogue” amid the fawning servility of the worshippers.

“For yours is the kingdom of God.” Matthew's τῶν οὐρανῶν is the obvious substitution of a Jew, which it is unlikely enough that Jesus would countenance by His example,¹ even if He quotes its use by others (Luke xv. 18, 21). The ground of the blessing, as in the other Beatitudes, suits itself exactly to the condition which is pronounced happy. The poor are rich indeed, heirs of a realm of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice, “a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where thief draws not nigh, nor moth destroyeth.” Happy such poor! poor indeed and miserable they who have already drawn all their treasure, and have no account when too late they would make a draft upon the bank of Heaven!

So to no. 2, with which John xvi. 20 has been already compared. *Happy they that mourn, for they will be comforted.*

¹ See Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 218: his argument does not seem to me conclusive.

In Luke—

Happy you that weep now, for you will laugh.

Alas (for you), you that laugh now, for you will mourn and weep.

This stands third in Luke's order, and third (but with a different no. 2) in the δ -text of Matthew. An arrangement supported by D and 33 (the "queen"), the Latins and the Curetonian, with Origen, Clement and Tertullian, must be treated with respect nowadays; but when the Lewis joins \aleph B and the rest to veto it we can hardly question the ordinary reading. Luke's order is another matter. He makes this Beatitude the second part of the blessing on the hungry. It seems possible that the δ -text reading in Matthew may be harmonistic in its origin, the Beatitudes which are linked in Luke being brought together in Matthew, though the change is not carried far enough to put verse 4 after verse 6. The juxtaposition of *poor* and *meek* would be an additional motive. It may at any rate be said that the Lucan order has nothing against its originality, though there is no decisive argument available.

It is difficult to determine between *πενθοῦντες* and *κλαίοντες*. On the one hand we have the former word in Isaiah lxi. 2, the great prophecy which formed the text of the Nazareth sermon, and may well be responsible for the blessing on the *poor* coming first here. On the other there is *πενθήσετε* in the Lucan Woe. It seems that conscious assimilation to Isaiah is the stronger motive, and we regard Luke again as closer to the Greek of Q. That *παρακληθήσονται* is due to Isaiah can hardly be doubted, so that Luke's *γελάσετε* is sure. But Matthew's alteration of phraseology, while not affecting the sense, is peculiarly happy in its suggesting an Old Testament reminiscence so characteristic of the Master.

Those of us who are much moved by great music can never forget the magnificent use of this Beatitude in the *Requiem* of Johannes Brahms. The repetition of the same music for the solemn "Blessed are the dead" at the end is one of the masterstrokes which make the *Requiem* heart-searching beyond almost any music ever written.

In the Woe we notice again the echo in James iv. 9, in which every element of the Lucan verse is repeated.

3. *Happy the gentle, for they will inherit the earth.* This is simply Psalm xxxvii. 11, with the addition of *μακάριοι* and *ὅτι* to bring it into Beatitude form. Its absence from Luke is most easily explained by supposing it foreign to Q at this point, and adapted for its place here by Matthew, either direct from the Psalm, or more probably from a Logion of different form. That *πραΰτης* was beatified by our Lord we know already: see Matthew xi. 29 and 2 Corinthians x. 1—cf. also James iii. 13. We have no adequate equivalent for *πραΰς*. It is unfortunate that the word "meek" has fallen on evil days. As we use it now, "meekness" could not fairly be called a virtue in any sense. It does not imply the iron will that holds rebellious nature in check, but the flabby feebleness that could not resent a wrong if it tried. Imagine the word "meek" applied to the Speaker of Matthew xxiii. ! The *πραεῖς* are the strong souls who beat down within them the impulses of selfishness, who refrain from quenching the dimly burning wick, or breaking off the bruised reed, just *because* they are so bright and so strong themselves (see Isaiah xlii. 4, R.V. margin). For those who refuse to join in the selfish struggle the earth waits as their inheritance. The "pushful" are ousted by those who refuse to push for place and power.

4. *Happy they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they will be filled.*

In Luke (cf. i. 53)—

Happy you who hunger now, for you will be filled.

Alas for you, you who are satiate now, for you will hunger.
In this place the interpretation of Matthew has entirely changed the original meaning; and we can only plead that the resultant meaning is in complete harmony both with Old Testament figure (Isa. lv. 1; Ps. xlii. 1) and with the teaching of Christ elsewhere (John iv. 14, vi. 35, vii. 37). It is hard to believe that Luke's form is not the original. It fits the parallel Beatitudes perfectly, and it invited alteration by the very frequency with which hunger and thirst were used as metaphors for spiritual longing.

In Matthew's Beatitude we note how the verbs *πεινᾶν* and *διψᾶν* have become transitive, just as *νηστεύειν* in the Oxyrhynchus Logion which presumably recalls this—*ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον κ.τ.λ.* The emphatic *αὐτοί*, "*they and no others*," continues as in the other sayings.

5. *Happy the compassionate, for they will be compassionated.*
This Beatitude, not in Luke, was probably due to the editor's adaptation. For as early as Clement of Rome—that is, not much later than the compilation of this Gospel—we find it in a series of sayings having the form of Matthew vii. 1. *Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῇτε* is as plausible a form as that in which Matthew gives it. The inevitable echo in James (ii. 13) decides nothing as to form, and would answer as well to a corresponding Woe. The teaching is, of course, that which is enshrined in the Lord's Prayer and the comment upon it found in Matthew vi. 14, 15, also in Matthew xviii. 21–35, and Luke vi. 36. Shakspeare's exposition is too hackneyed to quote, and too telling to pass by.

6. *Happy the pure in their heart, for they will see God.*
Here again we have the thought of a Psalm (xxiv. 4) put into the Beatitude form by Matthew, with support from a

Logion which is paraphrased in Hebrews xii. 14. The writer there is actually combining this and the following Beatitude, which probably stood together at some other place in Q, but the language is not exactly followed. (The iambic οὐ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον may be presumed accidental.) A suggestive contrast occurs in 1 John iii. 2. There the Beatific Vision produces the change into the same image; here the incipient God-likeness is rewarded by the Beatific Vision. The Beatitude links itself also with Matthew xviii. 10: the "angels," or heavenly counterparts, of the little ones are nearest the Throne because their earthly part has not yet been sullied in heart with sin. (Cf. Hastings, *B.D.* iv. 991b.)

7. *Happy the peacemakers, for they will be called sons of God.* For the first time the emphatic αὐτοί is possibly absent: its omission in \aleph C D and others is hardly balanced by its presence in B, etc., for the tendency to assimilate would be very strong. Once more the question arises whether the Beatitude originally stood in this form. Its absence from Luke is my main reason for doubting; but it may be noted that the echo in James iii. 18 would suit some other form equally well, and the saying may have owed to the editor its initial μακάριοι.

Like the fifth and sixth, this Beatitude is based on God-likeness; and the use for the first time of the term "sons of God," i.e. (in this case) men who reflect what "is an attribute of God Himself," shows that this attribute is the most important of the three. It is hardly necessary to copy from the concordance the passages which show how the old savage conception of the God of Battles—in which most Christian nations linger yet to their shame—has been uplifted by the coming of Him whose birth the angels heralded as bringing "peace among men of God's good pleasure." When "the Wisdom from above" became

incarnate below, the spirit of strife was understood at last to be only the activity of the animal in man, "the lusts that campaign in our members." Yet even in Old Testament days the Yahweh Sebâ'ôth, God of the armies of Israel, had been slowly transformed in the people's minds into the Lord of the hosts of heaven, and the Prince of Peace. And when New Testament writers bid us "*pursue* Peace"—not sham glory, bastard patriotism, dishonourable honour—they are quoting a Psalm.

Observe the difference between εἰρηνοποιοί and εἰρηνικοί. The latter may be merely passive. But οἱ ποιοῦντες εἰρήνην (James *l.c.*) are not content to be negative. There is great suggestiveness in the New Testament use of ποιεῖν, as contrasted with the πράσσειν of mere activity which sometimes in the same context describes the doing of evil. The *good* "that men do lives after them": good is a permanent product and evil a passing phase. "He that doeth the will of God abideth for ever"; and "His will is our peace."

Once more, "they shall be *called* sons of God." *Called*, in Heaven mostly, where perfect intelligences know how to call things by their right names. But even on earth the recognition is not wholly wanting. Witness the peculiar consideration shown to the Society of Friends, whose abandonment of the outward form of Sacraments must make their leading tenets the rankest heresy to those who lay stress upon that outward form. It is not strange that those who most conspicuously "*pursue* peace with all men" should so conspicuously succeed in showing in their members "the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord."

The saying of the Lord's Brother which we have been using to illustrate words of a higher authority still, reproduces with singular suggestiveness one of the most beautiful sayings of Hebrew wisdom (Prov. xi. 30):—

The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life ;
And he that is wise winneth souls.

To *win* men, not to force them—to plant once more the “fruit of righteousness” which is to turn earth’s desert into a “Garden of the Lord”—well may that be accounted the task of those who are most like God.

8. *Happy they that have been persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.* This Beatitude seems to be a generalising of the original in the second person which Luke preserves in its place and Matthew adds as an application. In the Old Testament the *poor* and the *persecuted* are epithets of almost identical meaning applied to the struggling church-nation, fitly consoled with the promise of a kingdom not of this world. The perfect participle recalls the thought of Revelation ii. 10 : it is those who have gone through the fiery trial and proved “faithful unto death”—“obedient unto (μέχρι) death,” like their Master—who have the reward of final perseverance.

What may be said of this belongs best to the Appendix, as Matthew makes it :—

Happy are you when they have reproached you and persecuted you and said every evil thing against you [falsely] for my sake : rejoice and exult, for your reward is great in the heavens ; for so they persecuted the prophets that were before you.

Ψευδόμενοι is omitted by the Lewis, by D and some Old Latin (including the Bobiensis), and by Origen, Lucifer and Hilary. It seems strange that it was not included among Hort’s “Western non-interpolations.” It appears to me a gloss of the same kind as εἰκῇ in verse 22, softening a phrase which was not understood. The libels were bound to be “false” if they were uttered for Christ’s sake.

Instead of “for my sake” the Old Syriac had “for my name’s sake.” D and the Old Latin repeated the “for

righteousness' sake" from verse 10. There are other traces of assimilation in the Lewis here, which reads "hate and persecute"; while D and some other Westerns (including *k*) alter the order of διώξωσι—has the verb come in from verse 10? On the other hand the Lewis omits *ὀνειδίσωσι*.

In Peter :—

Were you even to suffer because of righteousness, happy you ! (iii. 14).

If you are being reproached in the name of Christ, happy you ! (iv. 14).

In Luke :—

Happy are you when men have hated you, and when they have boycotted you and reproached (you) and cast out your name as an evil thing for the sake of the Son of man : rejoice in that day and leap, for lo your reward is great in heaven ; for in the same manner their fathers used to do to the prophets.

Alas when all men have spoken well of you, for in the same manner their fathers used to do to the false prophets. One curious difference between Matthew and Luke here is explained by Wellhausen as starting from the Aramaic "bring a bad name on you," which was translated ἐκβαλεῖν ὑμῶν ὄνομα πονηρόν. This is actually found for Luke in the Lewis, "put forth concerning you a name that is evil." It is tempting to regard this as the original reading in Luke and in Q, from which Matthew paraphrased. The form of the Greek text would come easily from a misreading of ὑμῶν as ὑμῶν, and a subsequent change of order.

By this time I hope we are ready to agree with Wellhausen's dictum that "the variants in Luke deserve throughout the preference," even though we admit with Dr. Moffatt that "Luke's rendering is truer to the letter, Matthew's to the spirit, of the original." In the case of this last Beatitude, indeed, the two versions represent two applications of the

same principle, Matthew's including times of actual persecution, while Luke's is restricted to conditions such as prevailed during the age of [comparative tranquillity before the fires of persecution were kindled, when the "sect" was "everywhere spoken against," and Christians had to endure that social ostracism which is often so much harder to bear than persecution itself. The significant *εἰ καὶ πᾶσχοιτε* of the Petrine form shows the transition to the new conditions. The application to actual persecution was obvious and wholly justifiable, but the words as originally spoken were more inclusive. Jesus warned His disciples of persecution at other times : here He contemplates conditions which would last longer, as long as faithfulness to His principles provoked antagonism, as long as religion should remain unfashionable and loyalty vulgar in the eyes of a world which became no whit more Christian when it learnt to pay lip-service to Christian forms.

The *χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιάμενοι* of 1 Peter iv. 13, just before the Beatitude, is one of the few external supports we have for the Matthaean against the Lucan phraseology. The vivid *σκιρτήσατε* (cf. Luke i. 44) can hardly have been invented, however. Notice the aorist imperative in Luke, going with the "in that day," the absence of which in Matthew fits the generalised form of the command.

Matthew's concluding *τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν*, omitted by the Lewis here, as in all the authorities for Luke, may be the editor's gloss, or, as Wellhausen suggests, a translation doublet from Aramaic. The prophets of the Old Dispensation and of the New alike bore "the reproach of the Christ."

It would be very easy to enlarge at any length on this new Law of the Kingdom, but we must forbear. We have tried to bring out the probability that our First Evangelist is responsible for its codification as we have it. A skilled lawyer will collect from scattered sources judicial decisions in equity which together make the authoritative law on some particu-

lar subject. His book will be recognised according to the fullness and accuracy with which he has made his selection, and this will depend on his own understanding of legal principles as well as on his industry in searching sources. In something like this manner our Evangelist selected dicta from the one Lawgiver to whom Christians listen. We recognise inspiration in the power that has enabled him to bring together just those elements which form the ethical code of Christianity, superseding the mainly external and negative Decalogue of the olden time. I say "superseding," but do not mean to suggest that the Ten Words deserve the shallow depreciation which was paraded with all the airs of a discoverer by a writer in the *Hibbert Journal* not long ago. Recognition of their permanent value is consistent with the realisation that they can no longer stand in the forefront of the Christian system as an adequate summary of duty. Every one of them needs the "But I say to you," transforming its whole character by taking it from outward action into the springs of action. And for this purpose the Matthaean Beatitudes serve better than any other ethical code. It takes us only a little way, for example, to say "Thou shalt not kill." The world accepts this easily (except in war time) but has its gloss ready—

Thou shalt not kill, but needst not strive
Officiously to keep alive.

The New Law beatifies the merciful and the peacemakers, and bids every man do as he would be done by. And so on with the other Commandments. Jesus concentrated the whole Law into one little word. His interpreter Paul showed Love at work, in that incomparable thirteenth chapter of the first letter to Corinth. It was reserved for the first Evangelist, who worked up Matthew's collection of sayings of Jesus, to give us a gem more sharply cut still, each facet flashing with its special brilliance, but with a light that is always one.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

ST. PAUL'S RULE OF LIFE.

(2 COR. v. 14.)

“THE love of Christ constraineth us” (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ σωνέχει ἡμᾶς). This beautiful and important phrase is given as a reason for the preceding statement : “Whether we are beside ourselves it is unto God ; or whether we are of sober mind, it is unto you.” It is not necessary for our present purpose to go into the interpretation of that statement except to draw attention to the words “unto God” (θεῷ) and “unto you” (ὑμῖν). These datives of *interest* (dativus commodi aut incommodi, Winer, part iii. § 36, 4b), denoting the person in whose favour a thing is done, closely correspond with the meaning of ὑπέρ, a word which dominates the whole of this passage, and St. Paul's meaning in verse 13 is, that whatever his acts or his conduct may have been, they were at any rate unselfish. He did not act or live for himself, but for the cause of God and for the sake of his disciples. He here proceeds to state the motive of this pure unselfishness. It is, he says, “because the love of Christ constraineth us. This, then, is St. Paul's rule of life ; not only the determining principle of his actions, but, when the significance of it is fully developed, the key to his conception of the Atonement, and of the work of Christ's ministry on earth, and of his own ministry and apostleship on behalf of Christ.

The love of Christ means primarily the love which Christ has for us, the love which He manifested by His atoning death upon the cross. It is this love, or the conviction of this love, which, St. Paul says, constrains him, i.e. is a binding force or influence on his life and actions. Whatever he does, he does in consequence of this binding or constraining love. It is the guiding principle of his life. It compels

him to walk in a narrow way, as when one walks in a road fenced in on either side.

The words which follow relate to an interesting moment in the spiritual experience of St. Paul. They give the reason why, and the time since when he was constrained by the love of Christ. This point of critical importance is lost in the rendering both of the A.V. and R.V. In both versions *κρίναντας τοῦτο* is rendered, "because we thus judge." But the aorist must refer to a particular moment in St. Paul's past experience which determined the whole course of his life and thought. It was as decisive a moment for the Apostle as for St. Augustine the moment when he heard the fateful words beneath the fig tree at Milan. The words, then (*κρίναντας τοῦτο*), must mean, "when, or because we thus judged," that One died for all. To judge is to come to a decision after weighing evidence. As soon, then, as the marvellous love of Christ with all its results came home to St. Paul, as soon as he felt a reasoned conviction that the death upon the cross was for him, and for all, the sense of the love began to be a constraining influence on his life.

St. Paul's decision, then, was that "One died for all." Whether this phrase was a Christian formula of belief to which St. Paul assented, or whether the expression is his own, cannot be determined. The more important question is at what precise epoch in his life the Apostle definitely came to the decision, together with all that it involved.

It is not to be supposed that the whole of the Christian faith was presented to St. Paul at the moment of his conversion. This indeed would be inconsistent with the account which the Apostle himself gives of his spiritual growth and knowledge. "I make known to you," he writes to the Galatians, "as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me

through revelation of Jesus Christ." He then proceeds to say, "when it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles ; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood : neither went I up to Jerusalem to them that were Apostles before me ; but I went into Arabia, and again I returned unto Damascus " (Gal. i. 11, 12, 15-17). This independence of human instruction is involved in the meaning of *κρίνειν* (to judge), which implies not only a reasoned decision, but also independence of judgment. It is probable, then, that the momentous conclusion both as to the truth of the fact that One died for all, and also as to the truth of the spiritual consequences of that fact, came home to St. Paul in that time of solitary reflection in the Arabian desert, not improbably, it has been inferred, under the historic cliffs of Sinai.

The omission of "if" (*εἰ*) in verse 14 is undoubtedly right. But the punctuation of R.V. would be improved by placing a colon or semicolon after "One died for all." These words state the fact ; the words which follow, introduced by *ἀρα* (therefore), state the inferences from the fact.

The first of these inferences is indeed a profound and remarkable one ; it is one that revolutionized life. St. Paul states that, as a consequence of One, that is Christ, dying for all, all died. *Συνεπέθανον* (died with) might have been expected in place of *ἐθανον* (died), but the inferential particle *ἀρα* (therefore) implies this close connexion with the death of Christ.

In two other passages St. Paul expresses the same profound spiritual truth—in Romans vi. 4, and Colossians ii. 12. In those passages the Apostle speaks of the believer being buried with Christ through baptism into His death, and being raised with Him through faith in the working of God.

What he there attributes to faith through baptism he attributes here to the response to the love of Christ. Christ had said, "If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto myself." And what St. Paul says here is a proof of the attraction of the cross. It so drew St. Paul with the cords of love that he became one with Christ. He died with Him and rose with Him. When the poet speaks of—

The soul, whose likeness with thy soul
Was but its love for thee (Rossetti),

he expresses the same thought of union through love. This oneness with Christ in His death and His life is no metaphor or figure of speech with St. Paul. It is a spiritual reality, which enables him to say elsewhere even more forcibly: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20).

It will be seen that, as a consequence of this intensely practical, but deeply spiritual, view of the effect and meaning of the love of Christ on St. Paul's mind an immense significance is given to the use of the preposition *ὑπέρ*. The root meaning of this preposition is *over*, as when the protecting champion fights over and in defence of his friend, as *μὴ θνήσχ' ὑπὲρ τοῦδ' ἀνδρός* (Eur. *Alcest.* 690). In Homer it is frequently used of prayer for the sake of another, as, *λίσσεθ' ὑπὲρ τοκέων γονοούμενος ἄνδρα ἕκαστον* (*Il.* 15. 660). The thought of substitution is derivative and inferential, not in the word itself, which has a wider range. The Shakesperian phrase—

whose feet were nailed
For our advantage on the bitter Cross—

conveys the meaning excellently in this passage. The love of Christ for man secured the unspeakable *advantage* of death and life in Him.

The next step in the Apostle's argument is to show the result of this momentous spiritual fact on life. In the first

place, it is the acceptance by the believer of the spirit of sacrifice. St. Paul recognizes the object of Christ's death, and he accepts that as binding on himself. The object of Christ's death [was: "That they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again." In one word, the object of Christ's death was to create in us the spirit of unselfishness, and of devotion to Him. The love of Christ must be the dominating influence in life. To bring this to a practical and individual issue, a Christian, and above all an Apostle, must live for others and not for himself. This is what St. Paul meant in the words already quoted immediately preceding the passage we are now considering.

Then follows an almost startling illustration of the devotion to Christ alone: "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." That is to say, no human teacher or leader of men shall claim our devotion or our imitation, not even Christ Himself as He was known in the flesh. The Christ whom we know, with whom we are united, with whom we died, is the Christ who died for us, who rose and is glorified. To know Christ after the flesh only is to be ignorant of His eternal existence, of His Godhead, of His Incarnation, of His death on the cross for our sakes, and of His glorious resurrection and ascension.

No words could express more vividly the completeness of the revolution in human life wrought by the death of Christ. There had in fact, as the Apostle goes on to say, been a new creation. This again is no figure of speech. All things had literally become new for St. Paul. He was living a new life from which the past was banished. For what is life? What does it consist in? Does it not consist in our aims, our desires, our motives, our pleasures, our secret thoughts?

And what St. Paul felt was that there was an absolute change in all these things consequent on his great decision. His passionate response to the immense love of Christ shut out for him all other aims, pleasures, motives and thoughts—all that he cared for or aimed at now was to do the will of God in Christ; to him “to live was Christ.” This was literally to be created afresh, to be a different person, living a life as distinct from the old life, in which there was no constraining love of Christ, as one man who does not know Christ is distinct from another man who loves Christ with all his heart.

St. Paul proceeds to show that, as a consequence of this new aspect of Christ, the true way of presenting the Gospel is not so much to set forth the external facts as to point to the invisible divine reality underlying the facts. Consequently he defines the gospel as—“God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses.”

In this definition St. Paul sums up the ministry of Christ on earth and in heaven. For with him there is no marked line of separation between the work of Christ upon earth and the work of the ascended Christ in heaven. Indeed he lays the greatest stress on the gospel of the Ascension. If he referred to the Gospel narratives as we have them, he would describe them as his friend and disciple St. Luke describes his gospel, as a treatise or record of all that Jesus *began* to do and to teach. He never lost sight of the continued work for us of the glorified and ascended Christ. This is, of course, the true significance of the often misquoted and misunderstood words which close the Epistle to the Ephesians: “Those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in incorruptness,” that is, in the glory of His eternity as the immortal Son of God.

Accordingly in the definition here given St. Paul wishes

to impress upon his converts this profoundly spiritual view of the ministry of Christ on earth. What he saw and loved to contemplate in the gospel was, "God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

With this Pauline presentment of our Saviour's earthly ministry it is interesting to compare the brief summary of the Gospel by St. Peter. In his first address to his fellow-countrymen on the Day of Pentecost he speaks of "Jesus of Nazareth" as "a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by Him, in the midst of you, even as ye yourselves know" (Acts ii. 22). And again, in the house of Cornelius, he speaks of Jesus as "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power by God, and going about and doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with Him" (Acts x. 38).

In these passages there is, equally with the Pauline definition, an acknowledgement of the Godhead of Christ. But St. Peter appeals to his hearers as witnesses of the inspired Manhood of Christ, and of His visible acts of power. It is the gospel for those who have known Christ after the flesh, and a witnessing to the deeds done in the flesh. It is a summary of the Synoptic Gospels as they have been delivered to us. And this must always have been the basis and foundation of all Christian teaching from the very first. The inspired narratives of Christ's visible ministry upon earth will always remain the most precious and dearly prized possession of mankind. But St. Paul invites, indeed earnestly persuades, his readers to see behind and within the visible working of the Man Jesus, the actual manifestation of the invisible God. He is carrying on those converts who are already well instructed in the facts of the Gospel, to the inner meaning of the facts and to the actual doer of them. "You have been taught," he says in effect,

“ about Jesus of Nazareth going about and doing good. In reality you have been taught what was the work of God Himself, manifested in Christ. And you have been taught the meaning of the work. It was a work of reconciliation. God was making a new creation. In Christ He was actually bringing all mankind into union with God once more. That was the inner meaning of the life of Christ—of the tempter overcome, of the patient endurance of suffering, of all the divine teaching, of the exhortation to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect, of the restoration of the dead to life, of the casting out of devils, of the healing of the maimed and sick, of giving sight to the blind ; the explanation too of the denunciation of sin, of the blessed promise of rest to the weary, and of forgiveness of sins ; above all, it was the explanation of the Incarnation, of the death upon the cross, and of the ascension into heaven. The explanation of all those acts of the ministry of Christ is that they were the acts of ‘ God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.’ ”

The Apostle then proceeds to give another conception of the work of God in Christ on earth. He adds the words, “ not reckoning unto them their trespasses.” We are accustomed to associate these words and the doctrine conveyed by them chiefly or only with the Epistles of St. Paul. Here the Apostle teaches us to associate them with the ministry of Christ. With St. Paul’s words to guide us, we can bring this truth into connexion with such words of Christ as that He came “ to seek and to save that which was lost,” and that He came “ to call sinners,” and said to those whom He had healed, “ Thy sins have been forgiven thee.”

It was all the more important for St. Paul to define clearly his conception of the gospel, and of the ministry of Christ, because the same gospel of reconciliation was committed

to him.¹ One of the effects of his close union with Christ was that Christ's work was his work, and one part of his response to the love of Christ was his ministry for Christ. The "therefore" of verse 20 immediately links the commission of verse 19 with the "embassage" of verse 20; but by a chain of reasoning it also links the "rule of life" (v. 14) with the necessity imposed by that rule in verse 20. And "died on behalf of all" (ὕπὲρ πάντων ἔθανεν, v. 14) has a near relation to "ambassadors on behalf of Christ" (ὕπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν, v. 20).

One word may be added as to the general application of this rule of life. The whole passage is no doubt, in its primary meaning, intensely personal—a record of St. Paul's individual spiritual experience, and of his claim to be a successor of Christ Himself in the ministry of reconciliation. But the application is universal—the same rule of life is binding on all Christians, and is felt to be binding by all who, like St. Paul, have decided that "One died for all, therefore all died."²

Moreover the same deep and esoteric view of the work of

¹ The rendering of v. 19 in R.V. reads somewhat awkwardly: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself . . . and having committed unto us (placed in us, *marg.*) the word of reconciliation." The meaning would be made clearer by resolving the participles into temporal clauses: "God was in Christ when He was reconciling, etc. . . . and when He placed in us the word of reconciliation." The Vulgate, followed by A.V., has more or less solved the difficulty by substituting a finite verb (*posuit*) for the participle. Both participles are noticeable; the imperfect καταλλάσσων denoting the continuous, unceasing work of Christ (John v. 17), the aorist θέμενος the single act of divine grace in the appointment to the apostleship.

² With this extended application of the rule of life συνέχειν acquires a further shade of meaning. Besides the force of constraining the individual life it would also signify to bind or hold together the community. The love of Christ becomes the unifying force, the rule which binds together the whole community of Christians. Compare Eur. *Suppl.* 312, where obedience to law is said to be the binding force of states:

τὸ γάρ τοι συνέχειν ἀνθρώπων πόλεις
τοῦτ' ἐσθ' ὅταν τις τοὺς νόμους σώξῃ καλῶς.

God in Christ during His ministry on earth is more than ever necessary now. The fault of the age has been materialism. In order to be convinced of spiritual truth, it has demanded the evidence of sight and touch. It has striven to explain away miracles, and to present the life of Christ vividly and picturesquely in its external aspects. In its bitterness against superstition it has refused to believe the invisible.

But a change is taking place ; and as religion tends to materialism, the tendency of science is increasingly to recognize that ultimate truth and reality lie beyond the world of sense. Accordingly science, instead of being a hindrance to faith in the unseen, is establishing that belief by its process of discovery. When Mr. Herbert Spencer sums up the result of research by the statement that "The persistence of the Universe is the persistence of that Unknown Cause, Power or Force, which is manifested to us through all phenomena" (*First Principles*, i. 258), there is a close approach to the conclusion of St. Paul that "the things which are seen are temporal ; but the things that are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 18). And when the poet characterizes the Gospel of St. John as "the acknowledgement of God in Christ," he characterizes also the Gospel of St. Paul.¹ In this one and the same gospel of the unseen and eternal lies the solution of the ultimate problems both of science and religion :

The acknowledgement of God in Christ
Accepted by the reason solves for thee
All questions on the earth and out of it,
And has so far advanced thee to be wise. (Browning.)

ARTHUR CARR.

¹ For a close parallel to 2 Cor. v. 14, see 1 John iii. 16.

NEHEMIAH'S JERUSALEM.

HAVING in the last of this series of papers examined the documents upon the period, and seen that recent objections to the authenticity of Ezra's Memoirs are insufficient, but that we cannot form exact conclusions as to his relations with Nehemiah and the dates of his appearances in Jerusalem, we proceed now to an account of the events which happened during the governorship of Nehemiah and a description of Jerusalem as he found her.

The policy of Nehemiah and Ezra may be regarded as twofold, but the end it pursued was virtually one. *First*, there was the Rebuilding of the Walls which had lain breached since Nebuchadrezzar's overthrow of the City in 586; and *second*, there became evident to the leaders during their operations on these the necessity of building a Fence of Law about the community itself: bulwarks to keep the blood, the language, the worship and the morals of Israel pure.

First: Nehemiah himself tells us that it was an account of the ruin of the Walls and of *the affliction and reproach* to which in consequence his returned countrymen were exposed that moved him to crave leave from Artaxerxes to go to Judah and *rebuild the place of my fathers' sepulchres: it lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire.*¹ The petition was granted, and in 445 Nehemiah arrived in Jerusalem under military escort and with letters royal to *the Keeper of the King's Forest, that he may give me timber to make beams for the gates of the castle which appertaineth to the House, and for the wall of the City, and for the house that I shall enter into.*² The Aramaic document in the Book of Ezra reports earlier attempts to rebuild the walls and their

¹ Neh. i.-ii. 5.

² ii. 8, 9.

frustration by Samaritan intrigue¹; these attempts (the account of which the compiler has obviously misplaced in his arrangement of the Book of Ezra) have been attributed by several moderns to Ezra himself.² Whether they actually took place under Ezra or not, Nehemiah alludes neither to them nor to him. After a survey of the ruins he induced a large number of his fellow-Jews to begin the restoration, which he carefully describes as not an entire rebuilding, but a *strengthening*, a “*pointing*” or *cementing*, a *healing*, and a *sealing* or *stopping of the breaches*.³ The restoration, which took fifty-two days, was finished by September 444, and the gates set up.⁴ Jerusalem, after an interval of 142 years, was again a *fenced city*. Gatekeepers and police were appointed with Hanani, Nehemiah’s brother, and Hananiah, the governor of the castle, in charge of the whole Town.⁵

Second: During the process of rebuilding Nehemiah encountered opposition from the same quarters, from which the earlier attempts are said to have been frustrated. *Sanballat the Horonite* and *Tobiah the servant or slave, the Ammonite*,⁶ had been alarmed at his coming to seek the welfare of the children of Israel, and unable to stop his operations, along with *Gashmu the Arab*, began to laugh us to scorn, and to spread the old story that by rebuilding the walls the Jews intended rebellion against the king.⁶ The

¹ Aramaic document = Ezr. iv. 8–vi. 18. The account of the building of the Walls is given in iv. 6–23 (verses 6, 7 are in Hebrew).

² See above, pp. 9, 14, 18.

³ *Strengthening* (Hiphil of the verb נָחַץ to be strong, and once, iii. 19. Piel), throughout ch. iii. E.V. *repairing*. “*Pointing*” or *cementing* (Kal of בָּנָה, probably a technical term, for which see the Lexicons), iii. 8, E.V. *fortified*. *Healing and sealing of the breaches*, A.V. *that the walls of Jerusalem were made up, and that the breaches began to be stopped*; R.V. *that the repairing of the walls of Jerusalem went forward*, etc., iv. 7 (Eng.) iv. 1 (Heb.).

⁴ Neh. iii. 1, 3, 6, 13 ff.; vi. 15, vii. 1; cf. Eccclus. xlix. 13.

⁵ vii. 1, 2.

⁶ ii. 10, 19; iv. 1 ff.

names of these persons, if they have been accurately transmitted, reflect the curious mixture of *the peoples of the land* which had taken place during the Jewish exile. Sanballat is a Ḥoronite, that is, from Beth-ḥoron, then a Samaritan town; for according to a probable emendation of the text he is described as *saying before his brethren, Is this the power of Samaria, that these Jews are fortifying their city?*¹ and with a Samaritan nationality his Assyrian name, “The Moon-god gives life,” would agree. Tobiah, on the other hand, like his son Jôhanan, has a name compounded of that of the God of Israel; he is called *the Ammonite*, but this may mean from Chephar Haammoni, or “Village of the Ammonite,” which lay in the territory of Benjamin. Gashmu is an Arabian name; these nomads have always been scattered across Judah. It is true that other meanings, as well as different readings, of those names have been suggested; but the latter are mere conjectures, and as the meanings just given suit the conditions of the time it is reasonable to accept them.² Samaritans, Jews, probably of that poorer class who had never left Judæa,³ and Arabs, whose assistance rival political powers in Judæa have always been eager to enlist—the trio represent an alliance, frequent in the history of Syria, between persons of different tribes and cults, all of them Semitic, and there-

¹ So the LXX. version, cod. B in Ἑσδρας B xiv. 4; the Greek of the Hebr. Neh. iii. 34 = Eng. iv. 2; cf. Guthe.

² For other meanings that *Ḥoronite* is from Ḥoronaim in Moab, and that *Ammonite* means one of the neighbouring children of Ammon, see Schlatter, *Zur Topogr. u. Gesch. Paläst.* 4, and Winckler, *Alt-Orient-Forschungen*, ii. 228 ff.; for other readings Cheyne, artt. “Sanballat” and “Tobiah” in *Enc. Bib.*, and the present writer’s “Beth-ḥoron” in the same.

³ Winckler, *KAT*³ 296, takes Sanballat and Tobiah as father and son, “representatives,” whether authentic or not, “of that branch of the royal family which had remained in the land,” and now claimants for the leadership. There are no grounds for either of these hypotheses—not even in the fact that later the “Tobiades” appear in opposition to the high priests.

fore more or less merging into each other, but bound only by a temporary community of material interests. The attempt has been made to impute to them some nobility of aim by representing them as a racial league, eclectic in faith, and ambitious to create a common national cause among the many factions of the land. But their eclecticism was obviously of that petty sort, which, without either strong intellectual force or sense of the supremacy of ethics in religion, or conscience of the moral unity of mankind, maintains its alliances and mixtures upon merely local or family considerations, or motives of gain, or sometimes only by the hostility of all its ingredients to the adherents of a higher moral standard. The attempt to argue that Nehemiah has misrepresented his opponents is futile, and its conclusions are disproved, first by the fact that Nehemiah and the allies faced each other from the beginning with an instinctive feeling on both sides of their essential hostility, and, secondly, by the knowledge which the subsequent fortunes of the tribes and cults of Palestine outside of Israel affords to us. In the alarm of the allies at Nehemiah's arrival *to seek the welfare of the children of Israel*, and in his retort to them, *You have no portion nor right nor memorial in Jerusalem*,¹ we touch those ultimate elements of human consciousness, in which Nehemiah was not rash in feeling the inspiration of God Himself; while the low moral character of the popular cults of Syria, which recent excavations have revealed to us, and the ease with which those cults allowed themselves to be absorbed afterwards by Hellenism, prove that for Nehemiah and Ezra to have yielded to the attempts to mingle the Jews with *the peoples of the land* would have been fatal both to the people and the religion of Israel.

During his operations upon the Walls, Nehemiah learned,

¹ ii. 10, 19, 20.

from Jews living outside, of the plan of his enemies to attack the builders ; whom, therefore, in one of the most gallant scenes in all the drama of Jerusalem's history, he armed as they built, and supported by a force of bowmen and lancers drawn up behind the Walls.¹ He soon discovered that such assaults from the outside were not all he had to fear. The alliance against him, with its right wing merging into Judaism, had friends within the Walls, such as we shall find every heathen power hereafter able to reckon upon in Jerusalem. They hired prophets, Nehemiah says, to work upon his fears, and seduce him to discredit himself with his people by taking refuge in the Temple from plans for his assassination.² Tōbiah, of the Jewish name, was in close correspondence with the *nobles of Judah*,³ that is, with some of the returned and orthodox Jews, for no nobles had been left in the land after the Babylonian deportations and the flight into Egypt. He and his son Jōhanan were married to the daughters of such families, and were thus related to the high priest Eliashib,⁴ who allowed Tōbiah, even after the Walls were built, but during Nehemiah's absence from the City, to occupy with his household stuff a chamber in the Temple courts.⁵ The Jews themselves had not recovered command of the trade of the country, and held close commerce with Syrians for fish, and with travelling dealers in all other kinds of wares, who found quarters within the walls.⁶ Consequently, as in later days from the same cause, the Sabbath was profaned equally with the Temple. Commerce nearly always implies *connubium* ; the blood of the Jews was mixed with that of other tribes, and the children grew up ignorant even of the Hebrew tongue. *In those days also I saw Jews who had married wives of Ashdod, Ammon and Moab, and their children spake half in*

¹ iv. 7-23.² vi. 10-14.³ vi. 17.⁴ vi. 18 ; xiii. 4.⁵ xiii. 4-9.⁶ xiii. 15-22.

*the dialect of Ashdod, and could not speak the Jewish language, but according to the language of each people.*¹ These evils are the same as Ezra reports having encountered upon his arrival at Jerusalem, either before or after Nehemiah²; and as having infected likewise the newly arrived Jews, fresh from the more orthodox atmosphere of Babylonian Jewry.³ But in addition, Nehemiah the governor discovered among the noble and ruling Jews a cruel oppression of their poorer brethren, whose lands they mortgaged and whose persons they enslaved for debt.⁴ From all these things experienced after their arrival in Jerusalem, Ezra, whose mission had been to enrich the Temple with gifts, and Nehemiah, who had set out to build the Walls, developed that wider policy, whose success constituted them the founders of Judaism. To men of such a conscience towards God and their race such a policy was inevitable in the conditions we have sketched. The mere Walls of the City and the Temple were not enough; the circumstances revealed in their construction demanded the more effectual "Fence of the Law."

Nor is it less natural to believe that, as his singularly candid Memoirs testify, Nehemiah achieved the beginnings of this wider policy largely on the strength of his own personality. By his immediate recognition of the wrongs of the poor, by his unselfish example and resignation of his rights as governor, by casting the household stuff of Tobiah out of the Temple Courts, by regulating the Temple organization and the distribution of tithes to the Levites, by shutting the City gates on the Sabbath, by contending with the men who had married foreign wives and even using (as he confesses) personal violence to them, Nehemiah, upon his own strength of spirit and body, started the necessary

¹ xiii. 24.² See above, p. 16.³ Ezr. ix. f.⁴ Neh. v.

reforms.¹ The "Memoirs" reveal a strong individuality, full of piety towards God and his people ; with a power both of sincere prayer and the persuading of men ; cut to the quick by the thought of *the place of the graves of his fathers* lying waste, but more concerned for the affliction and reproach of his living brethren, and with a conscience, too, of their sins, especially towards the poor and the easily defrauded Levites. Without Isaiah's vision or Jeremiah's later patience, he fulfils the prophetic ideal of the ruler, whose chief qualities shall be that he draws breath in the fear of the Lord, that he defends the cause of the poor, that he has gifts of persuasion and inspiration, that he is quick to distinguish between the worthy and the evil, and that he does not spare the evil in their way. Nehemiah is everywhere dependent upon God, and conscious of *the good hand of his God upon him*. He has the strong man's power of keeping things to himself, but when the proper time comes he can persuade and lift the people to their work. He has a keen discernment of character and motive. He is intolerant of the indulgent, the compromising and the lazy, even when they are nobles—who, as he expresses it, *put not their necks to the work of the Lord*.² In the preparations for his mission and its first stages at Jerusalem he is thoroughly practical ; and in his account of his building, as we have seen, careful and true to detail. As he becomes familiar with the conditions on which he has been called to act, and gradually realizes how much he must do beyond the mere building of walls, the growth of his sense of the grandeur of his work is very beautiful ; his sense of his loneliness not less pathetic. *I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down : why should the work cease, whilst I leave it and come down to you ?*³ There were few whom he could trust in the charge of the City and its gates ; he had to draw his police from the

¹ i.-vii., xii. 31, 37-40 ; xiii. 4-31.

² iii. 5.

³ vi. 3.

bands of Levites and musicians whose rights he had defended.¹ If sometimes his loneliness made him too suspicious of his opponents or of his own people, this was but the defect of his qualities or inevitable in the atmosphere of intrigue that he had to breathe. To be able to criticize the personal violence which he confesses, *his smiting of some* of those who had married foreign wives, and *his plucking of their hair*, we would need to have stood by him through all his troubles. The surmise is reasonable that such extreme measures may have been the best for the lax and self-indulgent among his contemporaries ; with Orientals treatment of this kind from a man they believe in more often enhances respect than induces resentment.² By the followers of Him Who in that same desecrated City overturned the tables of the money-changers, and scourged with a scourge of cords, much may be forgiven to an anger which is not roused by selfish disappointments or the sense of weakness, but by sins against national ideals, and which means expense to those who display it. Anger is often selfish, but may also be one of the purest and most costly forms of sacrifice. His disciples, who saw the exhaustion to which it put our Lord, said of Him, *the zeal of Thine House hath eaten me up*. Had we been present with this lonely governor, aware of the poorness of the best of the material he had to work with, and conscious, as we are to-day, of the age-long issues of his action, we might be ready to accord to his passion the same character of devotion and self-sacrifice. Such an "Apologia pro Nehemiâ" is necessary in face of recent criticisms on his conduct, all the materials for which have been supplied by his own candour. One of not the least faults of a merely academic criticism is that it never appeals to Christian standards except when it would disparage the men of the Old Covenant ; who at least under-

¹ vii. 1.² Witness John Nicholson and the Punjaubees.

stood as we cannot the practical conditions and ethical issues of the situations on which God set them to work.

In the great work which was then achieved at Jerusalem the presence of Ezra by Nehemiah's side is, as we have seen,¹ natural and authentic ; but it is impossible to date Ezra's appearances and difficult to relate the two men, who almost never allude to each other. Ezra's contributions to the work were the large reinforcement which he brought out of Babylonia to the loyal Jewish population of the land, his own zeal for reform, and above all his learning in the Law, without which the layman Nehemiah could hardly have succeeded in organizing the community. Ezra the man is scarcely so clear to our eyes as Nehemiah ; his own Memoirs are more overlaid with the work of the Chronicler. Yet we can see in him certain differences, some of which at least are natural to the priest as distinguished from the governor. Nehemiah came to Jerusalem with a military escort, and, as he had prayed to God to move the king's heart to this request, so he saw nothing in these Persian guards inconsistent with the Divine protection. Ezra, on the contrary, tells us : *I was ashamed to ask of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them that seek Him for good, but His power and His wrath are against all who forsake Him ;* and instead Ezra proclaimed a fast at the river Ahava, from which his company started, *that we might humble ourselves before God and seek of Him a straight way.*² As some one has said, while Nehemiah smote and plucked the hair of those who had married foreign women, Ezra in face of the same sinners rent his clothes and plucked the hair of his own head and beard and sat down stunned.³ His dialect of Hebrew is legal and priestly ; Nehemiah's is his own. Ezra has not, at first at

¹ Above, pp. 5 ff.

² Ezr. viii. 21-23.

³ ix. 2.

least, the governor's powers of persuasion and inspiration ; the people put him off from month to month.¹ When Nehemiah speaks they act at once. Still, if, as the Compiler says, Ezra came to Jerusalem before Nehemiah, his labours and failures no doubt prepared the way for the latter's success. What is hard to understand is that the two scarcely if at all mention one another. Would this mutual silence have been explained to us if we had had the rest of their Memoirs ? Was it due to the differences of their temperaments ? Or was Nehemiah, who found his only reliable officers, beyond his kinsfolk, among the Levites and musicians, suspicious of all priests ; and did the priest Ezra take the other side from him in his efforts to get the Levites their tithes ? These are questions, naturally rising from the materials at our disposal, but impossible to answer. Yet this is certain, that it was Ezra who brought and expounded the Law to Jerusalem. It is not necessary here to discuss the origins of that Law : all we need to keep in mind is that (as we have seen) the life and worship of the community had hitherto been regulated by the Deuteronomic Code, and that most of the reforms effected by Ezra and Nehemiah were on the lines of the Priestly Code. The Book which Ezra brought to the people was, besides, new to them.² We can have little doubt, therefore, that the Priestly Code was what Ezra introduced, and what he and Nehemiah moved the people to adopt. Except for a few later additions the Pentateuch was complete, and Jerusalem in possession of the Law-book which was to govern her life, till she ceased to be Jewish.

THE TOPOGRAPHY. THE VALLEY AND DUNG GATES AND THE DRAGON'S FOUNTAIN.

In this article it is not possible to deal with the wealth

¹ Ezr. ix. x.

² Ezr. vii. 14, 25 ; Neh. viii. 9 ff.

of topographical details furnished by Nehemiah.¹ I confine my remarks to the south-west section of the walls and to the position of the Valley and Dung Gates and of the Dragon Fountain, both because these form a starting point for all the rest and because I have some fresh considerations to bring to bear on them.

The Valley-Gate, *Sha'ar ha-Gai*, was, it is agreed, a Gate in the City Wall opening into the *Gai*, or *Gorge of the Sons of Hinnom*. We have already seen² that the only valley possible for this on the Old Testament evidence is the present Wâdy er Rabâbi, which in fact is the commonly accepted identification. The "Valley-Gate," therefore, opened in the west or south-west Wall of the City, above the W. er Rabâbi. Till recently it was placed at or near the present Jaffa Gate. Not only is such a position rather too far up the Wâdy for the Gate to be called by the name of *Gai*, because *Gai* means gorge and the Wâdy is shallow there, but it is at too great a distance from the Fountain Gate at the south-east corner of the City to suit Nehemiah's data. Professor Stade, therefore, in 1888, suggested a position for it near the south-west corner³ of the hill, where the Wâdy below is really a *Gai*. Here in 1894 Dr. Bliss began his celebrated excavations, which revealed a line of wall running south-east from the end of the Protestant Cemetery, and then, still on the edge of the hill, all the way east to the south-east corner of the City. In this wall just before it turns east, that is practically at the south-west corner, he laid bare an ancient gateway, with four sills, one above the other, and representing four different periods; and from there he traced north-east into the ancient City a line of street.⁴ On the first reports of this Gate, Professor Guthe

¹ ii. 13 ff.; iii.; xii. 31 ff.

² EXPOSITOR, Feb. 1906, 108 ff.

³ *Gesch.* ii. 167.

⁴ *Excav. at Jerus.* 1894-1897, 16 ff., London, 1898.

in 1895¹ identified it with the "Valley-Gate." In the spring of 1901, with Dr. Bliss' book before me, I twice carefully examined the course of the excavations, once under the guidance of Dr. Bliss himself, and, ignorant of Dr. Guthe's identification, I came to the same conclusion. In 1901-2 Professor Mitchell, of Boston, then in residence as head of the American Archaeological School, also independently reached this identification.² To these observations and the arguments built on them, which every visitor to the spot will find conclusive, I need add only the following. In the present shrunken walls of the City, the south Gate, which corresponds to this ancient one, is the Bab en-Nebi Daûd, or Şion Gate, the Bab-Sihyûn of the Arab geographers. It terminates what was a main line of street in Crusading times and is so still; and a pathway used by men and laden animals passes from it, not far from the Gate unearthed by Dr. Bliss, down into Hinnom, the bed of which is here from 130 to 170 feet below the sills of the Gate. In the bed it meets a path up and down the valley and another which crosses southward the opposite hill. There is no other gate on the line of wall traced by Dr. Bliss for about 1,800 feet, when one opens not far from the south-east corner; and 1,800 feet is approximately the 1,000 cubits which Nehemiah gives presumably (but not necessarily) as the distance from the "Valley-Gate" to the "Dung-Gate." In any case the Dung-Gate must have lain close to the south-east corner.

When Nehemiah issued by the "Valley-Gate" and before he came to the "Dung-Gate," he proceeded, he tells us, *towards the face of* [east of ?] *the Spring or Fountain of the Dragon—'Ain hat-Tannîn.* There is now no spring in Hinnom between the "Valley" and the "Dung-Gates" nor elsewhere; and the proposal to identify the Dragon's Spring with the Bir Eiyûb, hence called "Nehemiah's Well,"

¹ *M u D P V.*

² *Journ. of Bibl. Liter.* 1903, 108 ff., with plan. ;

is impracticable, for the Bir Eiyûb lies not in Hinnom, but much beyond the Dung-Gate and out in the Kidron Valley. The difficulty seems to me to be solvable only on the hypothesis which I advanced in a previous paper,¹ that we cannot always determine the ancient springs of Jerusalem by the position of the real or reputed springs of to-day, because of the heavy earthquakes which have visited the City. I now find a confirmation of this hypothesis in the name, "The Dragon Well." Professor Cheyne has taken it as an instance of the habit of folklore to identify serpents, in their friendly aspect towards man, with wells or springs. But it is not a serpent but a dragon we have to do with here, and dragons were not regarded as "friendly." I have collected and will publish, in a chapter entitled "Earthquakes, Springs and Dragons" in my forthcoming volume on Jerusalem, the evidence that both by the Semites and Greeks the dragon was identified with the earthquake, and with the springs which earthquakes sometimes bring to the surface. It is indeed singular how recent writers on Semitic religion and mythology, even when treating of springs, have left untouched the subject of earthquakes and their mythology; notwithstanding that earthquakes have been frequent and violent in Syria and that, as we see from the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the Greek geographers, they have powerfully impressed the religious imagination of all her peoples. The Dragon, *Hat-Tannin*, was, it is true, a sea monster, the embodiment of the turbulent arrogance which the ocean had inherited from primeval chaos; but when we remember how by the Semites the ocean was imagined to roll under the whole earth and contain the reservoirs of the springs, and that both Poseidon with the Greeks and Typhon with the Hellenized Semites were equally powers of the ocean and shakers of the earth; we

¹ EXPOSITOR, March 1903.

will not be surprised to find the Dragon, Hat-Tannin, also associated in the Old Testament with the earth and with the deeps, from which the fountains of earth arise,¹ or that in the Apocryphal Esther,² *thunderings and earthquake, uproar upon the earth, and two great dragons issuing forth* are closely put together. The religious imagery of this book further associates dragons and springs.³ The bed of the Orontes and its springs were supposed to be the work of a dragon ; to Typhon the Greek myths attribute the issue of many springs.

But now I come to the point of my argument. From the analogies quoted, and there are scores of others, Nehemiah's "Dragon Spring" in Hinnom ought to be derived from the observation that it first appeared after an earthquake. But this inference is strengthened by the fact that neither the name of the spring nor the presence of a spring in Hinnom is recorded either before or after Nehemiah's time ; for it is well known that many springs caused by earthquakes have only a short life. Some disappear in a few months, some after a few years.

One therefore, inclines with reason to the conclusion that in Nehemiah's *Dragon's Spring* we have the case of a temporary spring opened by earthquake and afterwards disappearing. But this confirms the opinion I have stated that earthquakes may have affected others of the real or reputed springs about Jerusalem, and have therefore introduced an element of uncertainty into the topography, to which almost no attention has been paid by those who have written on the subject. And, further, all this opens up an almost untouched field in Semitic mythology. Stark, in his instructive work on Gaza and the Philistine Coast (1852), is the only writer I know who has even hinted it.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Ps. cxlviii. 7. ² xi. 5 f. ³ x. 6 ; compare xi. 5 ff. with 10.

TARSUS.

XIV. TARSUS THE HELLENISTIC CITY.

IN the two centuries which followed the foundation of the new Hellenized Tarsus the surroundings and environment amid which St. Paul was educated were in process of development. But this period of Tarsian history is, if possible, more obscure than the earlier period. It was the fortunate coincidence of literary and numismatic evidence that illuminated the foundation of Antiocheia-on-the-Cydnus. Hardly a ray of light illuminates any point in the following period until we come down to the time of the Emperor Augustus and the great Tarsian philosopher and statesman Athenodorus. A very brief section will suffice for the end of the Greek period.

The oblivion into which the Greek name Antioch quickly fell, and the speedy restoration of the native Anatolian name Tarsus, may be taken as indicating that the Greek element had not attained undisturbed predominance in the newly founded city. The continuity of Tarsian history was not interrupted seriously : the city felt itself to be the ancient Tarsus, and not the new Antioch. Tarsus could never be a thoroughly Hellenized city : Antioch-on-the-Cydnus might have been so.

Upon the coins we read the same tale. The few coins struck by Antioch-on-the-Cydnus are thoroughly Hellenic in character : the head of the City (idealized as a divine figure wearing a crown of walls and turrets) and the sitting figure of Zeus have on the surface nothing Oriental about them. The sitting Zeus had long been a Tarsian type ; but formerly, even when no Aramaic letters gave him the Oriental name of Baal, there were usually symbols or adjuncts unsuited to the Greek Zeus, which gave an Eastern

and non-Hellenic character to the representation.¹ In the period 171-164 the Tarsian Zeus appears almost purely Greek.

Even the coins of the following period, on which the old name Tarsus reappeared, were distinctly more Hellenic than those of the older time. On some coins the Antiochian types remained, when the name of Antioch disappeared. Another common type showed the Good Fortune of Tarsus seated on a chair, with the river-god Cydnus at her feet : it was imitated from a famous statue by the Greek artist Eutychides, representing the Good Fortune of Antioch, the Syrian capital. But the Tarsian figure has something about it which stamps it as the Oriental imitation of Greek work. The Greek sculptor had showed the Fortune of Antioch seated on the rocks, at whose feet was the river Orontes : the Tarsian imitator placed his goddess on a chair, with which the Cydnus is out of keeping. The tone and harmony of a Greek ideal is wanting here. Moreover, another very common type which now appears for the first time on Tarsian coins is entirely and strikingly Oriental and Anatolian. This is a young male god, who stands on a winged and horned lion, wearing a tiara and holding in his hands sometimes bow-case and sword, sometimes flower and double-edged battle-axe. This deity is the same as one who appears on the walls of the ancient rock sanctuary at Pteria in the north-west of Cappadocia, in the stately procession of Hittite gods and goddesses who attend the great god and the great goddess as they stand face to face with one another in the Holy Marriage, the most sacred mystic ceremony of the whole ritual. Such an utterly unhellenic figure as this god stands in marked contrast with the Greek head of the City-Goddess, which

¹ Such as grapes and corn-ears, which marked the giver of corn and wine.

appears on the other side of the same coins. It is as if the double character and mixed population of the city, Greek and Oriental, appropriated each one side of the coins.

Tarsus, with the rest of Cilicia, long remained a part of the decaying Seleucid empire. The dynasty grew weaker ; disorder and civil war tormented the state ; but the arrogant ambition of princes who could hardly maintain their position at their capital on the Orontes, still prompted them to seek to enlarge their empire by adding foreign lands to their inheritance, as, for example, when the Egyptian throne was vacant in 123 B.C.

The Hellenic grasp on Asia was relaxing. There was little enough of Hellenism at a court like that of the last Seleucid kings ; but it was all that remained of the Greek sovereignty in the East.

During this period we hear practically nothing about Tarsus ; but it continued to coin its own money as a free city. Between 150 and 100 B.C. silver coins of the Seleucid kings bearing Tarsian types, but not the name of Tarsus, were sometimes struck. In the growing weakness of the sovereignty this can hardly imply that the Seleucid kings were tightening their grasp upon Tarsus : more probably the choice of Tarsian types was meant by way of compliment to the city as a main support of the Seleucid State.

As the Greek element in Asia grew weaker, the Asiatic spirit revived and attempted to throw off the bonds that European domination had placed upon it. About 83 the Asiatic reaction overwhelmed Tarsus. No authority records whether Tarsus was affected internally by the reaction ; but during the years that followed the armies of Tigranes, king of Armenia, swept over Cilicia and Northern Syria. Tarsus, though not named in the brief record, must have fallen under his power, as did Soloi which lay farther away to the west. Not until the reorganization of the East by

Pompey the Great in 65-4 B.C. was the European hold of Cilicia renewed: the Province of Cilicia now became far more important and well defined.

XV. TARSUS AS CAPITAL OF THE ROMAN PROVINCE CILICIA.

When the Roman province of Cilicia was first instituted about 104 or 102 B.C. neither Tarsus nor the Cilician plain was made part of Roman territory. They continued, as has been stated above, to belong to the Seleucid kingdom. The Province was instituted chiefly in order to control the pirates of Cilicia Tracheia (the mountainous region west of the level Cilician plain), and to maintain peace on the coasts and the waters of the Levant. Harbours and stations on the land of Tracheia were necessary for this purpose, but the plain and the cities of Cilicia proper were not occupied.¹ The Cilician Province was not as yet a strictly territorial province: the term was used rather in the older sense of "a sphere of duty." The Roman governor of Cilicia was charged with the care of Roman interests generally in the south and east of Asia Minor and on the Levant coasts and waters. He went wherever the pressing needs of the occasion called him. He seems, when it was necessary, to have been in the habit of marching through lands which were not as yet in any real sense Roman; and this implies that some vague right to free movement across those regions had been conceded to, or assumed by, the Romans. The two Provinces of Asia and Cilicia divided between them the execution of Roman policy in Asia Minor; and apparently the only principle of division was that what did not clearly belong to the Province of Asia fell in the Cilician sphere of duty.

The limits of the Cilician Province were vague and never defined: they varied, also, at different times. We find

¹ Appian, *Syr.* 48.

the governor of Cilicia active on the Pamphylian and Lycian coast and in Lycaonia. At one time even great part of Phrygia was detached from Asia and placed in the Cilician Province: such was the case, for example, when Cicero governed Cilicia in 51 B.C. This extension, evidently, originated during the time when the pirates constituted a danger so great that Roman ships were afraid to sail along the Levant coasts. The governor of Cilicia was then obliged to land at Ephesus, and to go by road into Cilicia. As he marched across Phrygia it was convenient for him to hold the assizes in the great cities. After Pompey put down the pirates in 67 and opened the sea once more, the connexion of Phrygia with Cilicia was maintained for a considerable time, and Cilicia was then the most important of the Eastern Provinces in a political view.

The indefiniteness in regard to Roman Cilicia between 103 and the reorganization by Augustus in 27 B.C. was due to the confused condition of Eastern politics. First there was the period of Mithridates and of the Oriental reaction which is associated with his name, and thereafter began the period of the Civil Wars. In the first period the Roman policy was uncertain in its aims and generally ineffective; in the later there was no policy at all till the issue of the struggle was determined.

In the decay of all the Greek dynasties, which marked the later second century and the earlier half of the first century, there was in Asia Minor no possible rule except either Roman or Asiatic; and, not unnaturally, the Roman government shrank from the gigantic task of administering the affairs of the East, while it was also reluctant to withdraw its hand and power from the country altogether. The uncertainty of Roman aims weakened its power; and the necessary result of the slackening of its grasp was that the Asiatic princes, like Mithridates of Pontus and Tigranes of

Armenia, seized the opportunity to assert their freedom against Roman dictation and to enlarge their kingdoms by western conquest. At first they even found allies among the Hellenic states and cities generally. Dread and dislike of Rome united Hellene and Asiatic. Mithridates not merely overran the whole of the Province of Asia, but even sent his armies into Greece and was welcomed for a moment as a deliverer by cities like Athens. He had, however, miscalculated his power, and he only succeeded by over-ambition in compelling the Romans to exert their power, and in making it clear that no compromise, no partition of Asia Minor between Rome and the Asiatic princes, nothing but war to the knife ending in either the subjection of Asia or the ejection of all Europeans, was possible at that time.

The task imposed on the Roman government, however, was too great. It could conquer, but it could not administer. Its general, Pompey, destroyed Mithridates and Tigranes, and regulated after a fashion the East. He set up kings and dethroned kings, founded cities, gave constitutions and laws ; but his work was ineffective, when the central government was paralysed. Some fixed purpose and definite policy was needed, but the Roman Senatorial government had no clear ideas in Eastern policy, and was powerless to maintain order.

To attain a state of permanent peace, it was necessary to conciliate in a single State the warring elements, Oriental and Western. These elements cannot be adjusted and conciliated by any government acting from above and from outside ; but they will work out their own balance and equipoise, if a strong hand enforces order.

Augustus at last, with his clear practical sense, seems to have divined the nature of the situation. Like the Senate, he shrank from undertaking the task of administering the East. He did not at first greatly enlarge the Roman terri-

tory. He continued the traditional Roman policy of entrusting frontier lands to dependent kings. But he insisted that these kings must maintain order and peace, and that they must administer their charge to Roman satisfaction. He regarded them as agents, entrusted with the duty of civilizing and training their subjects up to the level of orderliness suitable for incorporation in the Roman Empire as Provinces.

So he allowed a large kingdom in central Asia Minor to remain under charge of Amyntas, king of Galatia, until 25 B.C. Then, on the sudden and unexpected death of Amyntas in battle, he took the inheritance of this kingdom, and formed it into the Province Galatia, while the private property of the king, including the vast estates of the god round Pisidian Antioch, were added to his own private property.

The importance of the older Province Cilicia now disappeared. For about a century the Province Galatia included the charge of Roman interests and policy in central and eastern Asia Minor, while Cilicia was a mere adjunct to the great Province of Syria.

In this Cilician Province Tarsus necessarily played its part as the capital; but its name is rarely mentioned in the Republican time. It exercised little influence on a policy which was frankly Roman and almost regardless of the rights or interests of the subject people. Such had been the policy of the Republican government. The Imperial policy, on the contrary, was from the beginning thoroughly alive to the duty that Rome owed to the subject races. These non-Roman races were to be treated fairly, governed honestly and for their own benefit, educated up to the level of Roman citizenship, and gradually admitted to the citizenship year by year, now one person, now another, as each individual earned in one way or another this honour

and privilege. Such was the ideal which the Empire set before itself, and which the great Emperors, like Trajan, tried to realize. In the Imperial period, accordingly, there was far greater opportunity than before for the prosperity and development in its own line of a provincial city. Both the individual subjects and the cities of the Provinces had a career opened to them in aiding the wellbeing of the whole Empire. A provincial city henceforth could have a history of action, and not merely a history of suffering.

It would be too little to say that there was general contentment with the new order. The older Provinces in general, and Tarsus in particular, were filled with enthusiastic loyalty to the Empire, which had brought with it peace, order, justice, fair collection of a not too burdensome taxation, and good government generally, in spite of isolated exceptions and failures.

With the Empire Tarsus emerges once more into the light of history. We can hardly even guess what was the state of the city for a long time previously. We cannot say whether the Oriental element in the city was stirred to sympathy with the Mithridatic reaction. But it is certain that nothing could have happened which was more calculated to strengthen the Western spirit in Tarsus than the conquest by a barbarian like Tigranes. There was inevitably a revulsion in the city towards Hellenism, and Roman policy always was directed to encourage and strengthen the hold of Hellenism on the Eastern Provinces. The trained and practical instinct of the Rome did not seek to destroy Greek civilization in Asia in order to put Roman civilization in its place, but treated the two as allied and united in the task of training the Oriental. Hence the reaction from the barbarism of Armenian rule was in favour of Rome as well as of Hellenism.

Such being the character of the Roman administration

in the Provinces, it is not strange that Tarsus (which is practically unknown to us during the Republican period, except as a point on Cicero's journeys through his Province and a place of occasional residence),¹ begins to emerge into light the moment that Julius Caesar, the true founder of the Empire, entered its gate for a brief visit, during his march from Egypt northwards against the Pontic king and his Roman allies of the Senatorial party. Then the feelings and desires of the Tarsians begin to appear, and we find that they were frankly and enthusiastically for the Empire and against the Republic and the Senate. They were so devoted to Julius Caesar that they called their city Juliopolis, and afterwards they were well disposed to his nephew the future Emperor Augustus on his uncle's account. Cassius, acting on behalf of the Senatorial party, compelled the Tarsians and Tarkondimotos, the client-king of the eastern parts of Cilicia, to come over to his side in 43 B.C., when he was preparing for the campaign which ended in the battle of Philippi during the following year. But when Cassius marched on into Syria, and Dolabella approached Cilicia in the interests of the Caesarian party, Tarsus gladly joined him and took an active part in the war against Cassius and against the neighbouring city of Adana, which they considered to be favourable to Cassius. On the approach of troops sent by Cassius, however, Tarsus yielded without fighting. The Tarsians could make war on a rival town, but they dared not resist Roman soldiers. Municipal jealousies and rivalry were thus mixed with the wider politics of the time, and were with many people more powerful, because nearer at hand, than the larger interests

¹ It is only twice named in his writings, *Att.* v. 20, 3, *Fam.* ii. 17, 1; but it is implied as the place where he was residing during certain events; but no light whatsoever is thrown by this Roman governor on the condition of the capital of his Province. He was wholly taken up with Roman matters.

of the great world-struggle. Dion Chrysostom, a century and a half later, speaks of the old feud between Tarsus and Adana.

Cassius soon afterwards entered Tarsus, and requisitioned all the money he could from the state and from private individuals, but did not make any massacre.

When Antonius came to the East to represent the power of the victorious Triumvirs, in accordance with the arrangement which gave him the command of the Eastern Provinces and Augustus the command of Italy and the West, Tarsus hoped to reap the reward of its sufferings. It was complimented for its loyalty; it was granted the status of a "free city," *libera civitas*—which implied that while continuing to be part of the Empire, i.e. of the Province, it was governed according to its own laws and not on Roman law—along with the right to duty-free export and import trade. Antony resided for some time at Tarsus, and here occurred his famous meeting with Cleopatra, when the Egyptian queen sailed in her splendid galley up the river Cydnus and entered Tarsus in all the pomp of Oriental luxury.

The privileges which Antony had bestowed on Tarsus were renewed or confirmed by Augustus, when he became master of the whole Roman world after the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. Hence it was open to Dion Chrysostom, who naturally ignored Antony and took account only of the recognized line of transmission of the Imperial authority, to speak to the Tarsians about Augustus as the author of all their privileges. Augustus recognized the importance of Tarsus and treated it with great favour.

It is clear from the preceding account that Pompey, Julius Caesar, Antony, and Augustus are all likely to have given the Roman citizenship to a certain number of important Tarsians. Those who received this honour from Antony would certainly have to pay for it. Any Roman

Tarsian born about the time of Christ would probably have as his Roman names either Gnaeus Pompeius, or Gaius Julius, or Marcus Antonius.

XVI. THE ORIENTAL SPIRIT IN TARSUS.

It has been pointed out that the balance in the constitution of Tarsus depended on the presence of both Greeks and Jews in the state. The older native element (into which the original Ionian Greek stock had melted and been lost) was doubtless the larger numerically, but was probably more inert and passive, not guiding but following. The control and guidance lay in the hands of the two enterprising and vigorous races. This view implies that the Greeks and the Jews tended to opposite sides in municipal politics. In the Seleucid time it may be regarded as practically certain that the Greeks insisted on autonomy and laid more stress on the liberty and right of self-government in the city, while the Jews clung to and championed the Seleucid connexion. The Greeks always and everywhere in the world tended to exaggerate the rights of the individual. The Jews were more likely to remember that they had been placed in the city by the kings, and depended on the kings for protection against Greek dislike and enmity. The sense of a common interest made the Jews trusted and trustworthy colonists in the Seleucid foundations.

Now comes the question that is of the most vital importance for Tarsian municipal history. What form did this balance and opposition between Greek and Jew take in the Roman Tarsus? As before, the Greeks inevitably insisted on the rights of the individual, and on the freedom of the citizen from external control; wherever the Greek element is strong, the law is weak, and the government is guided rather by caprice than by principles. That has

been the fact throughout all history ; the Greeks are more prosperous under almost any other government than under their own.

This Greek spirit was diametrically opposed to the Roman law-making and law-abiding spirit. We should expect to find that the Roman administration in Tarsus trusted more to the Jewish element as more conservative and more serious, more consistent and less capricious, than the Greek. As regards the Republican period there is no evidence.

In the beginning of the Imperial time the city as a whole was agreed in support of the party of Caesar, and afterwards of the Triumvirs against the Senate. Partly the rivalry against Adana, still more the hatred against the tyranny of the Senatorial government, made the general body of the citizens unite. The Jews over the Roman world generally seem to have been enthusiastic supporters of Julius Caesar and Suetonius ¹ mentions that in Rome the Jews mourned vehemently throughout successive nights at his tomb ; and naturally they took an active part in the popular movements on his side. Naturally, also, the Jews of Palestine remembered that Pompey had profaned the Holy of Holies, and that Julius Caesar had avenged them of their enemy. There is no reason to think that the Tarsian Jews differed from the rest of their race.

The later history of Tarsus, however, as will be recounted in a following section, shows the Greek element about the time of Christ in strong opposition to the policy of Augustus ; and a suppression of popular liberty was carried through by Athenodorus, the friend of Augustus, armed with authority from the Emperor himself. The change in the constitution was emphatically anti-Hellenic in character, and could not but strengthen the Oriental element in the city.

¹ Suetonius, *Jul.* 85.

That brings up another question, what was the attitude of the large native population, the old Tarsian stock, in the Roman time? We may take Athenodorus as a specimen. He was born in a country village near Tarsus, from which he took his surname Cananites.¹ He was trained in the Greek philosophy, but his school was the Stoic, which had a marked Oriental complexion, and numbered among its leaders many men of Oriental birth. He would naturally carry with him the native population, for it was strongly Oriental in character, and therefore had little eagerness for that freedom of the individual, which was so dear to the Greeks that they were willing to sacrifice for it order, government, and the true freedom of the community as a whole. The opposition which, during the second century B.C., naturally existed between the old native population and the new colonists, both Hebrews and Greeks, must have gradually disappeared, as the generations passed; and new grouping of the Tarsian parties came into being to suit new conditions. The Oriental element, including both Jews and the old Cilician people, stood over against the Greek element. The latter was distinctly weaker, and the Oriental character in Tarsus must therefore have been strongly accentuated.

That this was so is proved by the evidence of Dion Chrysostom in the two orations which he delivered to the Tarsians about A.D. 110. He had come with the approval of the Emperor Trajan on an informal mission to several of the great cities of the East; his petition was, thus, not unlike that of Athenodorus in the time of Augustus. Neither held any regular office or was armed with formal

¹ I have suggested in Hastings' *Dictionary*, art. Tarsus, that he may have been a native of Cana or Kanna in Lycaonia; but this is of course uncertain, Strabo only says that the epithet was derived "from a certain village." The possibility that Athenodorus was a Jew, Kananites, might be suggested, but cannot be proved.

authority, but both carried with them the immense informal influence that the personal friendship and support of the Emperor conferred in the eyes alike of Roman officials and of the provincial population. Dion Chrysostom was a Greek of Bithynia, Greek not by race, but by temperament, by education, and by a really deep and genuine admiration for the ancient Hellenic literature and achievements in all departments of life. His evidence about Tarsus, therefore, is peculiarly valuable.¹

Dion was struck with the non-Hellenic character of Tarsus and of Cilicia in general. He acknowledges that Tarsus was a colony of the Argives ; but its spirit was not Greek. One asked, as one surveyed Tarsus, whether these people were Greeks or the worst of the Phoenicians. In speaking to the Rhodians Dion praised their Hellenism ; even a barbarian who visited Rhodes would be impressed by the old Hellenic spirit, and would recognize at once that he had entered no Syrian or Cilician city, but one that was truly Greek. In speaking to the Tarsians, on the contrary, he recognizes nothing that is Hellenic among them, and little that is good in manners. Only one Tarsian characteristic does he praise unreservedly, and that he praises, though it was, as he says, utterly different from the Hellenic custom. He was much pleased with the extremely modest dress of the Tarsian women, who were always deeply veiled when they went abroad. As Tarsian ladies walked in the street, you could not see any part either of their face or of their whole person, nor could they themselves see anything out of their path. They were separate from the public world, while they walked in it.

Now the difference of spirit between one race and another is nowhere else so strongly marked as in their treatment

¹ It is collected by my friend and old pupil, Professor T. Callender, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1904, p. 58 ff.

of women and their customs regarding the conduct and dress of women. The complete Oriental veiling of women was practised in Tarsus, and thus even this Graeco-Roman city was marked as an Oriental, not a Greek town. The Greek was swallowed up in the Oriental; and wherever the two elements meet in Asia, either they must hold apart or the Greek is gradually merged in the Oriental.

We may notice in passing how strong an effect was produced on the mind of St. Paul by his Tarsian experience in this respect. It is, as a rule, the impressions of childhood that rule one's prejudices in regard to the conduct of women; and the Apostle prescribes to the Corinthians ¹ a very strict rule about the veiling of women. Whereas men are to have their heads uncovered in church, it is disgraceful for women to be unveiled there. Now it would be quite possible that a Greek or a Roman should reach this opinion as to the conduct of women in church. So far as this command goes, it was quite in accordance with the ideas of the most orderly and thoughtful among those peoples and quite in keeping with the customs of good society. But there is one little touch in St. Paul's sermon about women that reveals the man brought up amid Oriental custom. He says that "the woman ought to have authority upon her head." This seems so strange to the Western mind that the words have been generally reckoned among the most obscure in the whole of the Pauline writings. A vast amount has been written by commentators about them, almost entirely erroneous and misleading, and sometimes false to Greek language and its possibilities. Most of the ancient and modern commentators say that the "authority" which the woman wears on her head is the authority to which she is subject—a preposterous idea which a Greek scholar would laugh at anywhere except in

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 3-16.

the New Testament, where (as they seem to think) Greek words may mean anything that commentators choose. Authority or power that belongs to the wearer, such power as the magistrate possesses in virtue of his office, is meant by the Greek word *ἐξουσία*. So Diodorus i. 47 describes the statue of the mother of the Egyptian king Osymandyas, wearing three royalties upon her head, i.e. she possessed the royal dignity in three different ways, as daughter, wife and mother of a king.¹ The woman who has a veil on her head wears authority on her head: that is what the Greek text says. To the European the words are unintelligible; but that is because he is a European. He must cease for a moment to be a European and pass into the realm of life and thought in which the words apply. Then he will understand them.

To the Oriental the words are simple and clear: they describe the ordinary fact of life. Their meaning has been well described by Rev. W. M. Thomson, in his work *The Land and the Book*, p. 31, in which he has set down the ripe knowledge acquired during thirty years' residence in Syria and Palestine. It was my good fortune not to read this book until I had been visiting Turkey for many years and had learned enough to appreciate the intimate knowledge which guides the thought and expression of the author. The book seems now to be little read; but scholars would find it far more instructive and educative than many of the more learned and more ignorant works produced by Palestinian tourist savants, who see only the surface of the land and people among whom they make hasty excursions, and then judge about custom and character.

¹ *ἔχουσιν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς*. This passage, which is so perfect an example of what Paul did mean, is actually quoted (e.g. in Heinrich-Meyer's *Kommentar*) as a proof that *ἐξουσία* means the authority to which the woman is subject.

I have no prejudice (as many young travellers have) against the tourist who dwells in the tents of Cook. On the tour he learns much in the subject which he has been previously studying, and in which he is able to learn more in a few weeks or months of travelling. But sometimes, conscious how much he has learned in the line of his competence and how much more real, perhaps, the history of Palestine has become to him, he fails to appreciate the limits imposed by the circumstances of his tour.

In Oriental lands the veil is the power and the honour and dignity of the woman. With the veil on her head, she can go anywhere in security and profound respect. She is not seen ; it is the mark of thoroughly bad manners to observe a veiled woman in the street. She is alone. The rest of the people around are non-existent to her, as she is to them. She is supreme in the crowd. She passes at her own free choice, and a space must be left for her. The man who did anything to annoy or molest her would have a bad time in an Oriental town, and might easily lose his life. A man's house is his castle, in so far as a lady is understood to be there ; without her it is free to any stranger to enter as guest and temporary lord.

But without the veil the woman is a thing of nought, whom any one may insult. The true Oriental, if uneducated in Western ways, seems to be inclined naturally to treat with rudeness, to push and ill-treat, a European lady in the street. A woman's authority and dignity vanish along with the large, all-covering veil that she discards. That is the deep-lying idea in the language of the Apostle.

XVII. ROMANS OTHERWISE TARSIANS.

With Pompey's settlement of the East in 64 B.C. began probably the long series of Tarsian-Roman citizens, one of whom is known to us as "Saul otherwise called Paul."

In the Republican time Roman citizenship was not so frequently given as in the Imperial time ; but it is natural and probable that Pompey, when he conquered the Cilician plain in 66, may have found some of the leading Tarsians useful to him in regulating the country for the new system, and rewarded them with the Roman citizenship. It was a matter of pride and also of real advantage in various ways for a Roman noble to have clients and connexions in the great provincial cities ; he aided them and acted for them in Rome, while they added to his dignity as a Roman and furthered his interests in their respective countries.

Such new citizens would naturally take his name, Gnaeus Pompeius, retaining generally as a cognomen or third name their original Hellenic designation. The Roman name Gnaeus Pompeius would thereafter persist in succeeding generations as a family name, and all male descendants of the family would bear it, being distinguished from one another by their various cognomina or additional names. If we had any lists of Tarsian citizens during the first two centuries of the Empire, we should probably find in them more than one family bearing the name Pompeius.

Hence arises a difference between Roman names in Republican usage and these Roman names in the Provinces. In strict Roman usage Gnaeus was the name of the individual, Cornelius or Pompeius or so forth was the name of the *gens* of which he was a member and the cognomen was often the name of his family (e.g. Scipio), though sometimes a personal epithet given to himself (e.g. Magnus to Pompey). But when a large number of families took such names universally as Gnaeus Pompeius, Gaius Julius, Tiberius Claudius, Marcus Antonius, these wholly ceased to be distinctive and the cognomen alone was individual and distinguishing. As the third name was the distinguishing name among such Roman provincial families, it was for ordinary

purposes far the most important. A person was generally known by it, whereas if he were mentioned by the more dignified appellation of Gnaeus Pompeius, this would leave his personality uncertain, for other members of one or more families were so designated. In some inscriptions it may be noticed that the more familiar part of the name, the cognomen (or even in some cases a fourth name, given as a still more familiar and, as it were, pet name) is engraved at the top in a line by itself in larger letters, while the full name is stated in letters of ordinary size in the body of the inscription. This, it may be observed, is one out of many ancient usages, in which large letters were employed to mark superior importance or direct the reader's attention to the words so emphasized (compare Gal. vi. 11).

The result of this superior importance was that the full name was used only in more formal and complimentary designation, and especially was necessary as a legal designation; but, in the ordinary life of Hellenistic cities like Tarsus, the full name sank almost out of use and out of notice. Hence no full Roman names occur in the New Testament, although it stands (according to our view) in such close and intimate, though often hidden, relation with the Roman life and policy in the Provinces; because the New Testament moves on the plane of everyday life, and is expressed in the common speech, sometimes in quite colloquial style. This is most noticeable in the personal names. In many cases the familiar abbreviated or diminutive form of a name was used in place of the correct form, as in Apollos, Silas, Loukas, Epaphras, Priscilla¹: in some of these the correct form of the word never occurs in the New Testament, in others we find both, as in

Epaphras and Epaphroditus,

Apollos and Apollonius (Bezan Text once),

Priscilla and Prisca;

¹ The termination *illa* was often used to form diminutive or pet names.

and, where both occur, it will be observed that either the natural tendency to more formal and elaborate politeness made some speakers use the correct name, whereas other speakers tended to use the more colloquial and familiar name, or the occasion sometimes demanded more formality from a speaker who at other times employed the familiar name; e.g. Paul uses the formal names Silvanus and Prisca, Luke always speaks of Silas and Priscilla; Paul uses the name Epaphras in writing to the Colossians and to Philemon, for they were familiar with the personality of their fellow-townsmen, but to the Philippians who were strangers he speaks of Epaphroditus. In these examples, which might be multiplied, we see the variations of ordinary social usage; some people tend to use diminutives more freely than others, and the same person will designate another according to the occasion, now more formally, now by the diminutive.

But the formal Roman double name was simply not employed at all in the ordinary social usage of Hellenic cities. The Greeks never understood the Roman system of names, and when they tried to write the correct full Roman designation of one of their own fellow-citizens, who had attained to the coveted honour of Roman citizenship, they frequently made errors (as is shown in many inscriptions), just as at the present day Frenchmen frequently misuse English titles, and speak of Sir Peel or Lord Gladstone. The reason why the Greeks failed to understand the Roman system of names was because they never followed the Roman fashion except under compulsion. Greek custom gave one name to a man, and knew nothing of a family name, still less of the Roman gentile name (such as Pompeius); and so all Greeks spoke of their fellow-townsmen who had become Romans by their Greek names, as if they were still mere Hellenes and men of one name.

Thus it comes about that, although Paul, and Silas, and

Theophilus,¹ and probably various others mentioned in the New Testament, were Romans, the full Roman name of none of them is mentioned. This silence about the full legal name is no proof of ignorance or inaccuracy : it is just one of the many little details which show how close and intimate is the relation between the New Testament and the actual facts of life. But just as certain is it that Paul had two Roman names, praenomen and nomen, as it is that he was a Roman citizen. No one could be a Roman citizen without having a Roman name ; and, though he might never bear it in ordinary Hellenic society, yet as soon as he came in contact with the law and wished to claim his legal rights, he must assume his proper and full Roman designation. The peculiar character of the double system and civilization, Greek and Roman at once, comes into play. In Greek surroundings the Tarsian Roman remains a Greek in designation ; but in Roman relations his Roman name would necessarily be employed.

If Luke had completed his story and written the narrative of St. Paul's trial in Rome, we may feel confident of two things, first that he would probably have mentioned the Roman name at the opening of the trial ; and, secondly, that he might perhaps have made an error in setting down the name in Greek. The strict legal designation required the father's name and the tribe to be stated, and these had a fixed order : the Greeks constantly make some error or other in regard to order, when they try to express in Greek the Roman full designation.

Not merely had Paul a Roman praenomen and nomen ; but he was also enrolled in one of the Roman tribes. This was a necessary part of the citizenship, just as enrolment in one of the city Tribes was a necessary part of the citizen-

¹ On the Roman official, ὁ κράτιστος Θεόφιλος, see *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 388.

ship of a Greek city. Now it may seem inconsistent that, after we have in a previous section proved so carefully that it was impossible for a Jew to become a member of an ordinary Greek city Tribe, and that a special Tribe restricted to Jews must be supposed in any Greek city where a single Jewish citizen can be proved to have existed, we should now lay it down as an assured and certain fact that Paul was an enrolled member of an ordinary Roman tribe. There is, however, no inconsistency. No Jew could become a member of a Hellenic city Tribe, because every such Tribe was a local body, meeting at intervals, and bound together by common religious rites, in which every member must participate. But the Roman tribes, though originally similar in character to the Greek Tribes, had long ceased to be anything more than political and legal fictions: they were mere names, from which all reality had long passed away; their members were scattered all over the Roman world; they never met, and therefore had no religious bond of union. It is indeed the case that, so long as the Roman people continued to vote, those members of the tribes who wished to vote and lived near enough to Rome must meet to exercise the vote, and some religious formality must have been practised at this meeting. But few of the widely scattered citizens could meet and vote. The Roman citizenship had other value than mere exercise of a vote, and citizens who lived in the provinces could never make any use of the vote. Moreover, after Tiberius became Emperor in 14 A.D., the Roman people ceased to meet in *comitia*, and the popular vote had no longer any existence. In tribes like these there was nothing to forbid a Jew from having himself enrolled; and all Jews who became Roman citizens were *ipso facto* made members of a tribe, but membership was a mere matter of name.

Inasmuch as the Tarsian Jews were citizens of a Hellenic

city, their language was necessarily Greek, and all who were citizens bore Greek names (or at least names which were outwardly Greek). In some cases they may have taken names which were merely Grecized forms of Hebrew words; but no example of this is known to me, though some may be suspected.¹ Some Jews in Hellenic cities certainly bore names which were equivalent in meaning to Hebrew names, as Stephanus to Atara, Gelasius to Isaac, Theophilus to Eldad or Jedidiah (among women Eirene to Salome).² But the great majority took ordinary Greek names, and hence arises the difficulty of tracing the history of the many thousands of Jewish families who settled in Lydia, Phrygia, and Cilicia. Only in a few cases can we trace a Jewish family through some accident betraying its nationality, as for example the curious name Tyrronius, found at Ieonium, Sebaste and Akmonia (in all of which Jews were numerous), is proved to be Jewish,³ and at Akmonia the wealthy pair, Julia Severa and Servenius Capito, who are so often mentioned on coins, were almost certainly Jews. But, as a whole, the large Jewish population of those regions disappears from the view of history owing to their disuse of Hebrew names, so far as recorded.

In Roman Imperial times, when the Jews were protected and powerful, there was in some degree a revival of purely Jewish names. The name Moses is perhaps found at Termessos in a remarkable inscription of the third century: "I, Aurelius Mo[s]es, son of Karpus, having been everywhere often and having often investigated the world, now lie in death no longer knowing anything; but this only (I

¹ Possibly the strange name Tyrronius may be a Grecized Hebrew name: *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. pp. 639, 647-50.

² In some of these cases probably the Greek name was translated from a Jewish name used in Jewish circles (see below).

³ At Akmonia C. Tyrronius Klados was chief of the synagogue in the second half of the first century: *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 650.

say) ‘be of good courage, no man is immortal.’”¹ Another case is Reuben in a long Eumenian epitaph, also of the third century.²

Even in Greek times, however, it is highly probable that most of the Jews of Anatolia had a Hebrew name, which they used in their private life, at home and in the circle of the Synagogue. The Hebrew name was an alternative name, not an additional or second name. The bearer was called by one or by the other, according to the occasion, but not by both: to use one of the few certain examples, the Jew was “Paul otherwise Saul,” “Paul *alias* Saul.” In Greek surroundings he bore the one name, in Hebrew surroundings the other.

Whether there was any principle guiding the selection of the two names is quite uncertain.³ Sometimes the Greek probably translated the Hebrew. This topic is part of a wider question, the evidence on which has never been collected and estimated. In the Greek cities and colonies in alien lands, Thrace, Russia, the Crimea, and Asia generally, numerous examples occur of the alternative name. In many cases these belong evidently to the two languages of a bilingual city, one is Greek, one of the native tongue; but that is not a universal rule; there are plenty of cases, especially of a later time, in which both are Greek. The fact seems to be that as time passed and one language established itself as predominant in the city, the alternative names still persisted in popular custom, but were no longer taken from two different languages. The original rule, however, is the important one for our purpose: viz., that

¹ I propose to restore the text (unintelligible in *Bull. Corresp. Hell.* 1899, p. 189), *Αὐρ. Μω[υσ]ῆς Κάρπου, ὁ πάντα πολλακίς γενόμενος καὶ τὸν κόσμον πολλακίς ιστορήσας, νῦν δὲ κείμει μηκέτι μηδὲν εἰδὼς ταῦτα* [δ]ε [μ]ό[ν]ο[ν], “*εὐψύχει οὐδεὶς ἀθάνατος.*”

² *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 386.

³ Sometimes the Greek probably translated the Hebrew.

the two names belong to the two languages in a bilingual society.

It was natural that the Jews should often take the names of those kings who had favoured them so much and opened to them the citizenship of many great cities. Alexander was certainly a common name among them, and perhaps also Seleucus, for both Alexander and Seleucus favoured and protected the Jews¹; but we can well imagine that after the restoration of Jewish power by the Maccabees the name of Antiochus may have become unpopular among the Jews. But, allowing that Alexander and Seleucus were popular names among them, it would be absurd to conjecture that every Alexander in Central Anatolia was a Jew. Even negative inferences are impossible. There is no reason to think that the Jews objected to names connected with idolatry, such as Apollonius, Artemas (or Artemidorus), Asklepiades, etc. Examples can be quoted of Jews bearing names of that kind, such as Apollonius or Apollos.²

Epigraphy, generally speaking, was public, not private; and in a Hellenic city public matters were expressed in Greek. Hence, as it is almost solely the public epigraphic memorials that have been preserved, we rarely know more than the Greek names of the Anatolian Jews, only occasionally the alternative name is stated. In the later Roman period, when a purely Jewish name was sometimes used in a public memorial, this may imply either that the alternative Greek (or Roman) name was disused by the individual, or that he had throughout life borne the Jewish name, without a Greek name. The examples of Moses and Reuben have been quoted above.

When a Jew, who was citizen of a Hellenic city, was

¹ Seleucus, *Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 545; Alexander, Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18, 7; *Cities and Bish.* ii. p. 672.

² *Cities and Bish.* ii. p. 672.

honoured with the Roman citizenship, the matter of nomenclature was complicated by the Roman triple name. As a Greek and as a Jew, such a citizen had a single name in each case ; as a Roman he had three names ; but the third of these names was, as a rule, identical with the Greek name. Thus we find a Jewish Christian at Hierapolis named "M. Aurelius Diodorus Koriaskos,¹ with extra name Asbolos." We may conjecture that Asbolos was the Christian baptismal name, "he whose sins had been black like soot." Diodoros was the Greek name, M. Aurelius Diodorus the Roman, and the second cognomen is of uncertain character, perhaps a familiar name in private life.

The Jews who became Roman citizens might naturally be expected to have as their *cognomina* in ordinary familiar use Greek names ; and especially the earliest of them must assuredly have had such Greek names. Latin cognomina, however, came into use occasionally ; and are more likely to have been employed in families where the Roman citizenship had been an inheritance for some generations. The one early case which is known with certainty is St. Paul, whose Roman first and second names are unknown ; his cognomen was Latin, not Greek ; and he had an alternative Hebrew name Saul. Yet he was a citizen of a Hellenic city, and therefore legally a Hellene (except in so far as Hellenic citizenship gave way to Roman citizenship), but as a Greek he passed under his Latin cognomen. As his father, and possibly also his grandfather, had possessed the Roman citizenship, the use of Latin speech and names was an inheritance in the family.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ ἐπίκλην "Ἀσβολος : the reading of the second cognomen Koriaskos or Korêskos is not quite certain, *Cities and Bish.* i. p. 118, No. 28 ; ii. p. 54 ff. ; Judeich, *Alterthümer von Hierapolis*, p. 142. I still believe against Judeich that the inscription is Christian, and specifically Jewish-Christian.

THE MYSTICAL DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

THE writings of Dionysius Areopagita became widely known in the first decades of the sixth century. Their diffusion through the Syrian Church induced Sergius of Ras'ain, the famous physician and writer on medicine, to translate them into Syriac. Sergius died in 536 A.D. ; and it is probable that his theological writings were the work of his earlier years. About 530 John of Scythopolis commented in Greek on the works of the Areopagite. And in 533 they were cited, at a theological assembly held in Constantinople, as the authentic writings of Dionysius, the convert and disciple of St. Paul.

In the Western Church the reception of these writings was, as we should expect, more tardy. But there is evidence that Gregory the Great had studied them ; and in his *Homilies on the Gospels* he speaks of them with respect, although he hesitates to affirm their authenticity. In the seventh century Popes Martin I. and Agatho accepted the Dionysian writings. They were sent by Paul I. to Pepin of France, in 758 ; but their importance was not then recognized. A few years later other copies were sent by Adrian I. to Abbat Fuldrad. In 827 still another set of the works of Dionysius was received in Paris—the gift of the Emperor Michael II. to Louis the Meek. The writings were committed to the care of the Abbot of St. Denys, Paris. Hilduin (d. 840), whose pleasure it was to identify Dionysius with the Apostle and Patron-saint of France, endeavoured, but without success, to translate the precious manuscripts into Latin. About 860 John the Scot (Erigena), who had brought to the Palace-school of France an ample store of learning, won in an Irish monastery, accomplished

the translation into Latin of all the works of Dionysius. He added original expositions on *The Celestial Hierarchy*, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and *The Mystical Theology*. The translation is bare and difficult : it has been characterized as a rendering of words rather than of thoughts ; but the annotations are sometimes singularly acute.

Erigena made no attempt to reduce to orthodoxy the writings of Dionysius : he endeavoured to interpret them simply, and according to their true meaning. His familiarity with the Syncretic philosophy of Alexandria made it possible for him to do this with understanding ; but he did not maintain the acrobatic poise of the Areopagite between pagan and Christian doctrine. In his teaching he leans heavily towards pantheism. Harnack reminds us that all of Erigena is to be found in the writings of Stephen bar Sudaili. But we can scarcely believe that the Irish scholar was himself a student of the Syrian mystic. Rather, the Platonist scheme of thought was transmitted to him through Clement of Alexandria, Victorinus, Augustine, and Maximus Confessor.

Erigena's doctrine of Christ is historically important. It moulded the teaching of the mystical sects of the Middle Ages ; through Eckart it stamped its impress on the Christology of the Church mystics ; finally, it passed into the transcendental philosophy of Germany. To understand it clearly one must go back for a moment to Neo-platonism.

Plotinus teaches that certain principles inhere in the soul—Movement, Energy, Mind, Unity. From the consideration of these we rise to the recognition of the All. *Movement* discloses to us the World of Phenomena, that which we call the material universe, although, strictly speaking, it is mere privation of being. *Energy* enables us to apprehend the Soul of the World, the originating cause of the individual soul, that which vitalizes all things, which

orders and rules. *Mind* directs us to that Universal Intellect which is cognizant of itself and, in itself, of the eternal ideas which become patent in time, and clothe themselves in creature existence. *Unity* leads to the acknowledgment of the primal, super-essential One, without distinction or qualities, yet existing in all, and embracing all.

The first of these principles fills space and time ; the remaining three form the Neo-platonic trinity.

Asserting, with Parmenides, the identity of knowing and being, Plotinus beholds in himself the One and the All. The soul images itself in the eternal Mind, which is, in turn, the image of Being. Being, possessing no determination, becomes actual only in its image—"Mind confers upon Being existence and understanding." From the interrelation of Being and Mind proceeds that essential energy which we call the World-soul.

With a good deal of strain and with serious injury to the faith, the Christian schematists adjusted to the theogony of the Neo-platonists the Scripture doctrine of God. They conceived of Deity as undifferentenced unity, receiving distinction, and so becoming actual, in the generation of the Son. The Son they identified with the Universal Intelligence of the Greeks, the Holy Spirit with the World-soul.

By casting the Christian doctrine of God into the mould which the later Greek philosophy had prepared, the Christian Platonists distorted the Scripture view of each of the Three Persons. But it is their representation of the Son which alone concerns us now.

In memorable words Augustine marks the vital distinction between Neo-platonism and Christianity : "Thou procurest for me, by means of one who was much puffed up with his own conceit, certain books of the Neo-platonists, translated from Greek into Latin. And therein I read, not indeed in the very words, but to the very same purpose,

enforced by many and diverse reasons, that 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God : the same was in the beginning with God : all things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made : that which was made by Him is life, and the life was the light of men ; and the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.' And that the soul of man, though it 'bears witness to the light,' yet itself is not that light ; but the Word of God, being God, 'is that true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' And that 'He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not.' . . . But that 'the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,' I read not there. . . . In that saying, 'The Word was made flesh,' Catholic truth is distinguished from the falsehood of Plotinus."

The incarnation of the Word is by no means the only distinguishing truth which separates the Platonist conception of the Universal Mind from the Scripture doctrine of the Son. But it may be said that every other divergence strikes its roots there. This will appear as we proceed.

The Church fathers believed that they had found in the incarnation of the Word the demonstration of the true being of God. This was the "one thing more" which, as it seemed to them, revelation had added to human thought. For the coming of Christ to earth not only signalized, it certified the union of matter with spirit, of the imperfect with the complete, of the finite with the absolute, of nature with God. And in this "Emmanuel-knot of union" reconciliation was made and harmony established between things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth.

But with Erigena Christ is a principle rather than a Person : the incarnation of the Word is the eternal becoming of the finite.

(a) The Alexandrines had taught that God, who is utter simplicity, attains to actual being in the generation of the Son. Following in the path of their speculation, Erigena affirms that the Deity is mere characterless unity which, passing forth from itself in ceaseless progressions and returning again in rhythmic cycles to its rest, realizes itself in the Eternal Mind, thence streaming forth in creative fulness. This Eternal Mind in which the Godhead becomes God is Christ. In Christ, the Father eternally effects the harmony of the divine attributes, or "names"—goodness, being, wisdom, righteousness, power, and the rest. Within the Godhead these exist "*primordialiter et causaliter*": they are distributed throughout creation by the Holy Spirit.

Similarly, Eckart teaches that the Living God is God in Christ. The Son is endlessly begotten and endlessly taken again into the One Essence. All that the Father utters, all that He effects, He utters and effects in the Son, in whom, as in a clear mirror, He beholds Himself and all things: "In one eternal moment God acts all things, and His action is the Son."

Böhme also maintains that "the abyss of the groundlessness" holds itself in absolute quiescence, while God, by an eternal act conceiving Himself, creates His own image. "As He manifests Himself to Himself, the Son is formed." In the mirror of the Eternal Wisdom the Godhead beholds itself in trinal oneness, and affirms itself as the Everlasting Yea.

(b) Erigena, in the spirit of pure mysticism, confines existence within the Wheel of Life, in which non-being returns, through becoming, to non-being. In this pauseless flow no explanation of the movement of the Absolute from simplicity to diversity appears. The only solution which lies to one's hand is that one should assume the elevation of the creature into the being of God. Erigena therefore

posits an eternal nature—"that which creates, and is itself created." Thus the trinal distinction within the Godhead is thrown back beyond cognition, and the creature becomes the affirmation of God.

The author of the *Deutsch Theologie* painfully elaborates this thought, and finds to his exceeding perplexity that it breaks as a spent wave against the Christian doctrine of God:—"Here we must turn and stop, or we might follow this matter and grope along until we knew not where we were, nor how we might find our way back again."

This Teutonic knight, recapitulating for the edification of his devout readers the conclusions of German mysticism, declares that to God, as Godhead, belong neither will, nor knowledge, nor manifestation, nor aught that we can name, or utter, or imagine. But to God, as God, it belongeth to express Himself to Himself in love and knowledge, and all this without any creature. But without the creature knowledge and love exist in God only as Being—not in act nor in reality. "Will, and love, and justice, and truth, and, in short, all virtues. . . . are, in God, one Substance, and none of them can be put in exercise and wrought out into deeds without the creature; for in God, without the creature, they are only as a substance or well-spring, not as a work." And as God is "pure act," God is not God apart from the creature.

With these "dark sayings" of the *Deutsch Theologie* Böhme is in substantial agreement:—"Here we have not yet cause to say that God is three Persons, but He is three-fold in His eternal evolution. He gives birth to Himself in Trinity; and in this eternal enfoldment He is nevertheless an only Being, neither Father nor Son nor Spirit, but only the eternal life of God. The Trinity will become comprehensible in His eternal revelation only when He reveals Himself by means of eternal nature—that is to say, in the light by means of the fire."

To one moving forward along these lines it became impossible to hold together in one scheme the Christian and the mystical doctrines of God. The author of the *Deutsch Theologie* plainly affirms the mystical doctrine :—"Thus the Self and the Me are wholly sundered from God "; then he hastens to fling the ample folds of Church orthodoxy over this naked statement—"and belong to Him only in so far as they are necessary for Him to be a Person." Schelling reduces the discord by rejecting the Christian doctrine of the Son. He draws the mystical doctrine of Christ into the framework of the transcendental philosophy. He affirms that the true Christ is not Jesus of Nazareth, whose life can be fully explained by the circumstances which environ it. Historical Christianity obscures the Christ-idea ; for, seeing that God transcends all temporal relations, it is impossible that He should be born in time. The Eternal Son is finite existence as it stands in the mind of God. The incarnation of the Son is the eternal becoming of creature existence, under the forms of space and time. The incarnation of God is an unbeginning, unending movement of Deity.

(c) Whereas to Erigena nature is the self-unfolding of God, man, who is the mid-point of the universe, combining in himself the most extreme antagonisms, is the image of the Word. In man God realizes Himself as *essentia*, *virtus*, *operatio* ; so that the Divine Trinity is (to our knowledge) only the far-flung shadow of the tripartite nature of man. It is obvious, therefore, that to Erigena the Son of God is at once the idea, the archetype, and the nature of manhood. The incarnation is the assumption by the Word of human nature in its entirety. And Christ is the fulness of humanity.

When one has come so far one begins to apprehend that the distinction between nature and grace has been lost.

Mysticism is not ethically true ; it is almost invariably characterized by a tempered sense of the sinfulness of sin ; and very many mystics have fallen into the deep pit which here lies across their path. Erigena did not quite save himself. The Christ of history, in his view, is not so much a Redeemer as a Guide and Precursor of His fellows. In Jesus of Nazareth, first, the essential Christ wrought into oneness that disintegration which resulted from the Fall. And it is by His teaching and example that there comes that awakening of Divine knowledge in man which is salvation. To the true mystic "introversion" is the new birth.

Amaury of Bènnès, near Chartres, was a disciple of Erigena and an important member in the mystical succession which led on to Eckart. He appears to have taught that man is consubstantial with Christ. The Brethren of the Free Spirit held that one who lived like Christ was not inferior to Christ. Some of them, following the process of Christ beyond the grave, dwelling with Him in the heavenlies, seated with Him on His throne of dominion, and "glorified together with Him," alleged that they had climbed to a serener point of perfection than was attained by the Lord in the days of His humiliation. They were holier than Jesus ; they were one with God. This crude arrogance repeated itself in many of the mystical sects which held themselves apart from Romanist, Lutheran, and Reformed alike. The Seekers maintained that "The mystery of salvation is no other than Emmanuel, or God with us, or God in flesh—not only in that man Christ, but in the whole Christ ; Christ being no more than an anointed one, and that one is our nature, or weakness, anointed with the Spirit." The Ranters declared that "The coming, dying, resurrection, ascension, and intercession of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ are merely figurative" ; that "The Christ of God is the universal Christ" ; and that "The

Christ whom we adore is the indwelling Christ." The Children of the Light affirmed that to know the hypostasis of the Son is to know the Son in oneself: "The saints," said Erbury, "that's the Son."

(d) The doctrine of the recapitulation of all things in Christ which had been impressed on Erigena by the Antiochenes, possibly also by Methodius, and certainly by Maximus Confessor, brought into clearness our Lord's official position as Representative of the race, and Head of the new humanity. The parallel of the two Adams supplied many of the terms in which this conception was expressed. "Christ is the Second Adam," says Erigena, "because in Him is restored to simplicity that which in the First Adam was scattered and broken."

With much grace of speech Julian of Norwich relates a vision which "our courteous Lord" showed to her, in order that she might understand how, "by the endless assent of the full accord of all the Trinity, the Mid-Person willed to be Ground and Head of this fair Kind; out of Whom we be all come, in Whom we be all enclosed, into Whom we shall all wend."

She saw God seated upon His throne; and before Him a servant—in which sight there dwelt a mystery. *Outwardly* the servant was "clad simply as a labourer which was got ready for his toil; and he stood full near the Lord. . . . His clothing was of a white kirtle, single, old, and all defaced, dyed with sweat of his body, strait-fitting to him, and short, as it were an handful beneath the knee; threadbare, seeming as if it should soon be worn out, ready to be ragged and rent. . . . And *inwardly*, in him was showed a ground of love; which love that he had to the Lord was even like to the love that the Lord had to him." That servant stood mystically for Adam, and All-man, and the Son of Man, and the Mid-Person of the Trinity, which is "rightful Adam";

“for Jesus is all that shall be saved, and all that shall be saved is Jesus.”

In Church mysticism the doctrine of the representation and headship of Christ shades off into the Pauline teaching of Christ living in the hearts of gracious men. The author of the *Deutsch Theologie* asserts that, “Where the truth always reigneth, so that true, perfect God and true, perfect man are at one, and man so giveth place to God, that God Himself is there, and yet the man too, and this same unity worketh continually, and doeth and leaveth undone, without any I, and Me, and Mine, and the like ; behold, there is Christ, and nowhere else.” Hilton of Thurgarton enjoins the contemplative to realize his true being in Christ : “It behoveth thee to delve deep in thy heart, for therein Jesus is hid ; and cast out perfectly all loves and likings, sorrows and fears of all earthly things, and so shalt thou find Wisdom, that is, Jesus.” And Francis de Sales says, “There is no longer any ‘Me,’ or ‘My.’ My ‘Me’ is Jesus ; my ‘Mine’ is to be His.”

In Puritan England there was a fresh reversion to Platonism. At first it was turbid and obscure, but after a time it ran clear. At length the “Cambridge Platonists” were able to assimilate the doctrine of Plotinus : they reduced it to such harmony with Anglican theology, that, though “the cross shone but dimly” in their writings, there was nothing peculiar in their doctrine of the Person of Christ.

1. One of the earliest of the seventeenth century Platonists in England was John Everard. His conception of the essential Christ is bare in the extreme. With the help of the Aristotelian categories he succeeded in reducing Platonism to absurdity. “Can you but take all accidents from everything, and that which remains is Christ. . . . As if you take from me all height and depth, all greatness

and littleness, all weight and measure, all heat and cold, and all kinds of matter and form—for these are all accidents—and then that which is left is He that bears up all, even Jesus Christ, blessed for ever. For there was something of me before I was either high or low, great or little, heavy or light, old or young, and that was Christ, the beginning of all things.”

2. Peter Sterry, Court Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, constructed with much painful labour a scheme of thought according to which Neo-platonism becomes the interpretation of Christianity. He repeats all the familiar phrases with a poetical intonation. His doctrine of Christ, in briefest outline, is as follows.

(a) Christ is the Supreme Reason who comprehends Himself and all things in that One who transcends both multiplicity and unity, even God.

(b) In the eye of God He is the eternal Image of all images : to us He is at once the image in which each thing is seen and the light by which that image appears. His manifestation is the coming of God as God, the discovery of His very being, and of all truths in Him.

(c) He is the Seed of the world, giving life to all things, riding forth in a chariot of light upon the face of all forms of things, bringing forth in Himself the creation, brooding over it until it break the shell of this dark flesh, and converting it to His own light and image. Behind the visible forms of things He hides Himself ; all creatures are the print of His feet ; and their whole conduct the motion of His feet.

(d) He is the redemption of the creature. Every fleshly thing is a veil between the creature and Deity. Christ comes consuming the flesh, calling the creature into spirit. By His coming in creaturehood and fleshly nature He redeems the flesh and the creature. “ Our Lord Jesus was

in nature—so He became capable of being. He sinks Himself out of nature into darkness, which is a shadow flying round about this creation—so He died. Through this darkness He shoots Himself forth into the light of God which encompasseth all—so He is risen from the dead. By this death all things die ; His death being the universal one, including and bringing forth all particular deaths. For the world is crucified by the cross of Christ. By His resurrection all things are raised into the life of God, as the soul raiseth all parts of the body, making to itself so many several resurrections in them.”

3. A still more complex system was wrought out in the restless mind of Sir Harry Vane, the politic lord of Raby.

Vane wrote a number of theological treatises, all highly mystical, and all hard of interpretation. The “peculiar darkness” of his religious writings has been the theme of copious sarcasm. Baxter says, “His obscurity, some thought, “was designed ; some thought he did not understand himself. He was able to speak plain when he pleased.” Sir Benjamin Rudyerd describes Vane’s theological works as “too high for this world, and too low for the other.” Bishop Burnet regarded their cryptic character with amazement, and confesses, “Though I have sometimes taken pains to see if I could find out his meaning in his works, yet I could never reach it.” A later writer speaks of the “unaccountable medley of enthusiasm and incomprehensible nonsense” to be found in Vane’s treatises. And so subtle a thinker as David Hume affirms that these writings are “absolutely unintelligible,” presenting no traces “of eloquence, or even of common sense.”

It does not need so imposing an array of authorities to convince us that Vane’s mystical writings are exceedingly hard to understand. But it would be an unwarrantable reflection on one of the wisest men of his age to assert that

they are undecipherable. The difficulty of interpretation does not seem to lie in the remoteness of his thought—his mystical philosophy is quite congruent with the popular mysticism of his age. There is, it is true, a certain mingling of elements—Platonism and Behmenism, the Contemplative Theology and the doctrines of the Seekers are flung into a witch's caldron and left to seethe and interfuse. But that is quite after the fashion of the time, and presents no insurmountable difficulty. The real perplexity—one which almost confounds the careful reader of Vane's religious works—is that he constructs his speculative scheme within the strict lines of Puritan orthodoxy. The philosopher writes as a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines ; he wears a Geneva gown ; he marks each stage of his progress by the citation of an appropriate text of Scripture ; he constructs his mystical doctrines in terms of the federal theology—a very bed of Procrustes to a Platonist.

The depth of religious feeling which marked the age of Puritanism threw an unmistakable emphasis on the distinction between nature and grace to which allusion has already been made. The doctrine of the two Adams had helped to impress that distinction ; the doctrine of the two Covenants made it still more evident.

(a) With all Neo-platonists, Vane teaches that God is simple, incomprehensible essence, unable to communicate Himself directly, either in creation or by revelation. Being in Himself incommunicable, He condescended to clothe Himself with a two-fold creature-form, natural and spiritual. Christ is that Person in whom God first forms Himself. He is the original and primitive pattern of all perfections, the root of all being.

(b) Corresponding to the two-fold creature-form of Christ there are two creations, and Christ is Head of both. In the one He is related to the creatures according to the Covenant

of Nature—this we call His first appearance ; in the other, according to the Covenant of Grace—this is His second appearance, or coming. In the first creation God gives us ourselves ; in the second, Himself.

(c) The first appearance of Christ is His coming forth in the natural creation. All things were created by Him, and were pronounced by Him to be very good ; yet they had in them the seed of decay. In His second appearance He comes to change the natural creation into spirit and incorruptibility, to breathe into it the very breath of God. As the Head of both creations He first effected this change in Himself. Jesus of Nazareth was the most perfect righteous man that ever was. As a branch, He had a heavenly place in His Head and Root, whereby He was found in union with the Word of life. By this emptying of Himself, He was led out of the first, or natural creation, and taken into a new spring of light and divine birth, wherein He became the ingrafted Word, being rooted in God in such wise that the Father became all His life, activity and power. This renunciation of self, whereby He became one with the Father, was accomplished through His sufferings and death. The power of that death shall be seen in us when we follow Him in self-crucifixion.

(d) But the first Covenant appeared so excellent that men elected to remain in it, contrary to the will of God. By this choice sin entered into our nature, and man fell. From this disablement he shall be redeemed by Christ.

(e) Man, redeemed and renewed by Christ, must render up the ruling power of his own spirit to be bruised, crucified, and triumphed over by the fire-baptism of the Spirit of Christ upon it. This perfect work of Christ is now in progress, although it is not yet fully disclosed. It is hidden in individuals who have gone forth from Babylon, and are the spiritual seed, the true Israel of God, separated from all

church-order and now living in the wilderness, awaiting the promised glory.

DAVID M. M'INTYRE.

*THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF JESUS CHRIST IN
RELATION TO CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.*

It is proposed in this paper to point out : First, with what qualifications Christians, generally speaking, regard Jesus Christ as unchangeable ; and, Secondly, that His Person, even as already imperfectly comprehended, constitutes a test of doctrine, as to whether it be in principle true or false, and that fuller comprehension of His Person embodies the line along which the true development of Christian doctrine must proceed in the future.

It may help to give our thoughts on this subject a right direction if we begin by an attempt to get a clear grasp of the exegesis of the *locus classicus* about the unchangeableness of Jesus Christ : Hebrews xiii. 8, 9. “ Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea, and for ever.”

The closing chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, from which those words are quoted, has no direct connexion with the treatise, carefully planned and elaborately worked out, which occupies the twelve preceding chapters. Bishop Westcott, in his commentary, entitles it A Personal Epilogue, and points out that it deals with three distinct topics : the social duties of the Hebrews, their religious duties, and the personal instructions of the writer.

The words we have chosen as our starting point come from the opening of the second section, that on religious duties ; and it is not very easy to trace the connexion of thought in this paragraph. The slight obscurity which we perceive is, no doubt, due to the state of things—moral and

spiritual—in which the Epistle was written, which, in fact, caused it to be written. It constantly happens in letters that the writer does not deem it necessary or prudent to give explicit expression to the thoughts which are suggesting to him what he is writing. He knows that those for whom the letter is primarily intended will be able to read between the lines, that their cognizance of the circumstances will supply what is not distinctly expressed, or not expressed at all. In the case before us, Bishop Westcott is probably right in reading between the lines “ the presence of a separatist spirit among those who are addressed.”

Having said so much on the section generally, it will be sufficient for our present purposes to indicate the connexion between verse 8, and those which precede and follow it. Verse 7 runs thus : “ Remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God ; and considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith.” The phrase rendered “ the issue of their life ” means the closing scene of their life, as public and visible to all, rather than the net result of their life taken as a whole. It suggests some scene of martyrdom in which a Stephen, or a James the Great, or a James the Just had given a public exhibition of faith triumphant over cruel ignorance. The lesson taught by such endings of life the Hebrews are bidden to observe carefully, and to imitate the faith which inspired them.

Bishop Westcott traces the connexion of the following words thus : “ The thought of the triumph of faith leads to the thought of Him in whom faith triumphs,” *Jesus Christ*. “ He is unchangeable,” *the same yesterday, and to-day, yea, and for ever*, “ and therefore the victory of the believer is at all times assured.” Then we read, *Be not carried away by divers and strange teachings*. “ The unchangeableness of Christ calls up in contrast the variety of human doctrines. The faith of the Christian is in a Person and not in doctrines

about Him." It may be added that in the term *divers*, (*ποικίλαις*, *various*, sometimes rendered *manifold*) there is a contrast implied with the one and the same Jesus Christ, while the *strangeness* of the new teachings would be evident when they were compared with that of the departed pastors, whose example the writer has just held up for imitation.

I propose to consider the affirmation as to the unchangeableness of Jesus Christ in connexion with the words that follow it ; not with the preceding context. Our reference Bibles remind us of the application to Jesus, in the first chapter of the Epistle, of the Psalmist's words : "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of Thy hands : They shall perish ; but thou continuest : And they all shall wax old as doth a garment. . . . But Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail." We are also referred to the momentous claims made by our Lord Himself, "Before Abraham was, I am," and "I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty." But in the verse now under consideration, the epithet *the same* seems to be used in a sense somewhat different from that unchangeableness so grandly predicated of Him in the passages just quoted. There it is His Person in the most absolute sense, as Creator and sustainer of the universe, that is referred to ; here, *Jesus Christ is the same* rather refers to His Person in relation to us, as revealed to us and in us, as revealed ever more and more fully, as always summing up all necessary doctrine.

Jesus Christ is the same, yet, such are the limitations of our outlook that we do not always think of Him in precisely the same way.

There are perhaps three conceptions of our Lord, in Christian theology, which may be stated here in the order in which they have been revealed : First, we have the histori-

cal Jesus of Nazareth—I use the term historical in the strict sense, i.e. Jesus as He appeared in the history of the world, born in the reign of Caesar Augustus, crucified in the reign of Tiberius Caesar, under Pontius Pilate. We have first, then, the conception of Jesus in His human activities, “going about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil,” and also fully realizing in Himself and in His work the inspired adumbrations of prophecy, and so seen to be Jesus the Christ.

Secondly, we have the spiritual conception of Jesus Christ the Son of God, as a regenerating force energizing in the world of humanity, the Life of the Church and of every member thereof. The transition from the first stage of human thought about Jesus to the second is indicated in St. Paul’s words : “Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more.”

Thirdly, we have Jesus Christ ascertained by the intellect as God the Son, the Second Person in the Trinity, coeternal with the Father, the Creator and upholder of all things, the Light that lighteth every man.

The conception of Jesus Christ as God the Son, the Creator, certainly seems to us an advance beyond the conception of Him as the Son of God, the Life of the Church ; yet possibly I have erred in speaking of them as successive revelations ; since it would be impossible to disprove that they were simultaneously grasped by such minds as those of St. Paul and St. John. They are, however, distinct conceptions, as was proved by the Arian controversy. But there can be no question as to the posteriority in point of time of the conception of Jesus Christ as the Life of the Church to the conception of Him as simply the Christ. The New Testament supplies abundant proof that a considerable section of the Jewish Christians never advanced beyond that first stage. Their failure to do so was of course illogi-

cal and inconsistent ; and also we may well believe that the Apostles and those most in sympathy with them passed at once to the fullest and most adequate conception of their divine Master ; nevertheless, the first two stages of belief are clearly marked as distinct.

And for us, as for all later Christians, the three conceptions, historical, spiritual, intellectual, remain distinct. They do not, indeed, involve to our minds any contradiction or inconsistency. Some of us have never analysed our beliefs about our Lord at all. We all, we who hold the Catholic faith, believe all three simultaneously ; but we do not *see* all three simultaneously. The Christos Pantocrator, the Almighty Christ, who looks down with a calm regard from the apse roof of a Greek or Russian Church seems to the non-Christian mind quite other from the Jesus of whose gracious words and loving deeds we read in the Gospel story ; and that picture again does not directly or obviously suggest a sentiment such as this : “ Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory.” Nevertheless we feel as each picture passes before us, that it is true, and that “ Jesus Christ is the same ” in these varying conceptions of Him.

Keeping in mind the cautions which have been just indicated, we may say that the revelation of Jesus Christ as God the Son is logically later than the other two ; and yet it is, from the theological standpoint, logically more fundamental. Those who hold the Catholic faith as to the Person and Natures of our Lord read their Bibles by light derived from the doctrine that Jesus Christ is “ the very and eternal God.” Take away that basal belief, and the Gospel story becomes the narrative of a tragical fiasco, and the Epistles of the New Testament reflect the hallucinations of disordered imaginations.

Again, it is not a little remarkable, as indicating the intellectually or logically fundamental character of the conception of Jesus Christ as God the Son, that there is now no controversy on this point between any of the many branches of the Church Universal. Easterns, Romanists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists are unanimous in their belief in the essential Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. Some individuals in these different bodies may not express themselves in the theological terminology of the fourth and fifth centuries, but all recognize the finality of the decisions then reached.

The same unanimity cannot be said to exist with respect to the conception of Jesus Christ as the Life of the Church and of each individual believer. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that the intellect alone is not so exclusively appealed to in this question as in that of the Deity of Christ. Here ethical and emotional considerations play an important part. Associated with this aspect of Jesus Christ are all the controversies that harass the Church as a whole, and produce searchings of heart in individual souls; all, in a word, that concerns personal religion in theory and in practice—the forgiveness of sins, the means of grace, the ministry, the sacramental system, public worship. We are so constituted that we cannot help regarding differences on these points as of vital importance. We dare not, in regard to these matters, “sit as God holding no form of creed, but contemplating all.” And yet when we are “delivered from the strivings of the people,” and are not compelled to render a logical account of the life whereby we live, we are glad to acknowledge our real ignorance of the working of the means devised by God “that His banished be not expelled from Him”; and we appreciate the clear spiritual sight of the Apostle who could say, “What then? only that in every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ

is proclaimed ; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

Well might St. Paul say so, in a world, as he saw it, perishing for want of a firm standing-place in faith and morals. "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Of course it is not, it cannot be, a matter of indifference whether the superstructure we build thereon—the superstructure of thought, expression, practice—be of costly stones or stubble, yet we have the Apostle's assurance that those who build anything on the one foundation shall be saved, even though it be "through fire."

But we have to recognize not merely contemporaneous differences, at times sharply antagonistic, in Christian men's conceptions of the manner in which Jesus Christ imparts His life to them, but also we have to learn that there is a development from age to age in men's apprehension of Jesus Christ in His relation to humanity as a regenerating force energizing in the spiritual, intellectual, and social world of man. The one fact, indeed, involves the other. In every department of being or of knowledge in which we observe development or evolution, e.g. civilization, there are always to be found side by side individuals or classes representative of every stage of development. There may be a general advance, but all do not advance at the same rate, or on the same level.

It is disturbing to some minds to be obliged to take knowledge of the fact that there is development or evolution in religion, as in everything else. There is a natural craving for absolute truth in matters of religion : in things that do not concern us so closely we acquiesce contentedly enough in relative truth. And yet the undoubted facts of our own personal spiritual experience ought to help us to understand that the spiritual apprehensions of humanity must become wider, deeper, loftier as the centuries pass. Jesus Christ is

the same as He was when we were children ; but our thoughts about Him, if we have thought at all, have undergone a very considerable development. Those who have not deliberately checked their spiritual life have “grown in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

It may perhaps be well to point out that the affirmation of the unchangeableness of Jesus Christ followed by the warning, “Be not carried away by divers and strange teachings,” cannot be interpreted as a denial, conscious or unconscious, of the possibility of any development whatever of Christian doctrine. On the contrary, it is rather an indication of the line along which true development must proceed. The writer who, in the exordium of his Epistle, gave its classical phrasing to the doctrine of the evolution of the religion of Israel is not likely to have thought it possible to stereotype the outward expression and inward apprehension of the New Covenant, “God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners.” The divine who enriched the Church with the most elaborate treatise of constructive theology in the New Testament, and who must have been conscious, to a far greater degree than St. Paul could have been, that he was giving a permanent expression to new doctrines—he surely would have been the last to deny this privilege to others, in other ages.

In any case, whether he thought of the Church as having a long future or not, the writer to the Hebrews has in this passage given us a test by which we may distinguish true from false developments in doctrine : “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, yea, and for ever. Be not carried away by divers and strange teachings.” There is no need for a discussion as to the precise form that these “divers and strange teachings” assumed. The principle which they embodied is quite independent of the manner of its

expression. History repeats itself ; not in the garb and speech and customs of men, but in the conflict, again and again, of fundamental principles of conduct. So it is in the history of religion. In the case before us " the divers and strange teachings " would lead to a reversion to the Judaism of the day, the principle underlying this reversion being a denial of the sufficiency of the finished atoning work of Jesus Christ. There was an eclectic spirit abroad ; and it is probable that the most dangerous of the teachers against whom the writer warns the Hebrews gave the name of Jesus Christ an honourable place in their system, " holding a form of godliness [i.e. Christianity], but having denied the power thereof." But, in effect, they denied the present power of Jesus to deliver from sin. They denied that Jesus Christ of yesterday was the same to-day. Their development was a false one. And the same may be said of all the aberrations from the Christian faith noticed in the New Testament.

It would seem, then, that we are entitled to lay it down as a guiding principle that any teaching that can be shown to be subversive of the claims made for and by Jesus Christ in the Gospels is a false development. I am aware that this way of putting the matter involves certain large assumptions as to the Gospels. But as the whole discussion has interest only for those who make those assumptions, we may here treat them as axioms. The Gospel presentation of Jesus Christ constitutes for us Christians the root and trunk of the tree of Christian speculation. Any higher growth which can be proved to be different in kind to the nature of the root and trunk is thereby proved to be a diseased growth. In other words, we must progress consistently with what we have learnt historically and intellectually about Jesus Christ. In " going onward " we must " abide in the teaching of Christ " (2 John 9).

The line of true development in Christian doctrine, as

in personal religion, is thus from faith in Jesus Christ to faith in Jesus Christ. It is most significant that in two passages, written about the same time, in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians respectively, St. Paul explicitly affirms this to be the direction of Christian doctrinal evolution. The starting-point is found in Colossians ii. 19, where the error of the false teacher is declared to result from his "not holding fast the Head, from whom all the body . . . increaseth with the increase of God." And the goal of Christian faith and practice alike is indicated in Ephesians iv. 13-15, where the Apostle declares the grand purpose of the gifts of grace bestowed by the risen yet indwelling Lord to be that "we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God. . . . unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that we may . . . grow up in all things into him which is the head, even Christ."

It may, it doubtless will, be said that this is very vague, and does not give us the positive leading which we desire in an age when "divers and strange teachings" have lost none of their power to "carry men away" from Christ. More positive leading we certainly cannot get, though it may be pretended to, in our present probation state. And yet surely we have not meditated altogether in vain, if we have reminded ourselves that the historical Jesus Christ is Himself the steadying and guiding principle of all Christian teaching. "Remember," said the dying Apostle to his son Timothy, "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel" (2 Tim. ii. 8). *Ubi Christus, ibi Ecclesia*. Where Christ is, there is the Church. There too is Christian doctrine, sufficient for life, if not adequate to satisfy every possible human need. And if we are able to feel, with thankfulness and humility, that our own theology is fuller and richer than that of

centuries nearer the starting-point, it is not that Jesus Christ of to-day is different from what He was yesterday, but that He has revealed to us, more fully than before, aspects of His work in the past, and has disclosed departments of His activities in the present where formerly men did not see Him working. And we look forward without misgivings to the future, assured that to other types of human mind in other lands, and to minds of our own type in the generations to come, Jesus Christ "the same for ever" will reveal knowledge of Himself to satisfy needs intellectual, spiritual, social, which have as yet formed no expression. It ought to be unnecessary, as it is in truth absurd, to say that Christians need not be uneasy about the future of the faith.

"Hitherto hath the Lord helped us." Reflection on this fact ought to have power to banish from the minds of some religious persons what St. Hilary called "an irreligious solicitude for God."

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

THE last two numbers of the *Mitteilungen d. vorderasiat. Gesellschaft* (1906) are monographs of more than merely technical interest. Part II. contains a valuable study of the oldest history of Cyprus by Reinhold Freiherr von Lichtenberg, in which he argues that Cyprus, Troy and Phrygia shared a common culture. The booklet is illustrated with pottery specimens, and, whilst appealing mainly to those interested in the problem of the Kefti and the Mycenaeans, bears indirectly upon the vexed question of the Philistines. In Part I. Winckler, on "der Alte Orient und die Geschichte," maintains his former views regarding the character of Oriental history-writing with his usual force. The value of his work lies chiefly in the appreciation of the fact that mythological elements floated about and attached themselves to one and another of the great heroes of antiquity—a fact, however, which can be admitted without the necessity of applying the mythological "key" to excess.

But the most important of recent contributions to the Old Testament, and one that is bound to attract considerable attention, is Ed. Meyer's *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (Halle a. S.), a bulky volume of nearly six hundred pages, dedicated to Nöldeke in honour of the veteran Orientalist's seventieth birthday. It is an elaborate investigation of the early period of Israel: the traditions of its origin, its sagas, and the growth of the tribes into a people. The introductory essay on the Moses-story and the Levites has already been published in a condensed form in the article to which reference has been made in these pages (EXPOSITOR, May, p. 479); other chapters deal with the

general scheme of Israelite mythology and genealogy, the patriarchs, the clans and tribes lying outside Israel, etc. Bernhard Luther, whose instructive study of Israelite tribes will be familiar to readers of the *Zeitschr. für d. alt-test. Wissenschaft* (1901), is responsible for a careful monograph on "The Yahwist," and for shorter studies on "The Romantic Element in Hebrew Narratives." The work, as a whole, is not easy to assimilate, and is so full of matter that it would be impossible to notice it at all adequately within these limits. Where nearly every page bristles with suggestions, it must suffice to designate the book as the most stimulating and instructive contribution which we owe to the well-known historian.

Eduard Meyer's position in the Old Testament field is already familiar, of course, from his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, vol. i. (a new edition of which is to be expected) and his more recent *Entstehung des Judenthums*. His thorough acquaintance with ancient history in general has given him the faculty of estimating intuitively the character of the literary material with which he has to deal, and prevents him from falling into the error of placing undue reliance upon special "keys" of investigation, whether metrical, genealogical, mythological or astral. But although his grasp of facts is comprehensive, and although his methods are illuminating, one may venture the opinion that where the Old Testament is concerned he does not make sufficient allowance for all the possibilities.

Perhaps the most instructive of his principles is the emphasis he lays upon the distinction between a nomad or pastoral folk and one that is settled and agricultural. This is important, because the differences show themselves in the respective traditions, and it is one of the most delicate of problems to determine the extent of the literature which has been written or revised under the

influence of nomadic ideas. Writings which have taken shape in a nomadic or semi-nomadic environment will ignore the culture enjoyed by settled communities, and it is scarcely necessary to point out that this has a bearing upon "archæological *versus* literary-critical" controversies. But, in addition to this, it is evident that at any given period two contiguous groups may be separated by a great sociological gap which will be reflected in the traditions of each, so that the sociological test *per se* is inadequate unless supported by other considerations.

Further, in such investigations as these undertaken by Meyer and Luther, it is evident that two points are of the utmost importance. First, where it can be shown that the sources are composite, it is necessary to consider whether the component parts do or do not imply different historical views; and, secondly, since literary criticism has shown how abundant were the traditions which existed (whether written or oral), it is well to remember that isolated narratives cannot always be treated as though they represent the only view that was current. It is because of the limitations imposed upon the Old Testament student by reason of his material that certain well-known principles of historical research cannot be rigorously employed. To reject the impossible or improbable and to treat the residue as genuine is an unsound method, as has been wittily demonstrated when applied to such a story as "Puss-in-Boots"; or to admit no evidence until it can be placed beyond doubt is a legitimate canon where the available material is abundant. But in dealing with the comparatively scanty remains of Hebrew history, more latitude must be allowed for the peculiar characteristics of the Semitic mind, and for the propensity to clothe historical fact in an un-historical dress.

One is obliged to study the historical connexion in its

widest extent with the fullest recognition of such limitations as these, and the very fact that the evidence is so frequently composite renders it necessary in the investigation of any particular period to devote equal attention to other periods from which the relevant sources may date. The elaborate discussion of the early history of the southern clans which Meyer and Luther have provided will prove invaluable to those who have followed the studies of Steuernagel and H. W. Hogg, but it lacks completeness because little attention has been paid to the subsequent periods when the literary material was taking shape. Meyer's extremely careful sketch of Caleb, for example, will be helpful; but, so far as has been observed, no notice is taken of the fact that the important passages in Numbers xiv. 20 sqq., Deuteronomy i. 36, Joshua xi. 6 sqq., which betray particular interest in the clan, are comparatively late. This is a literary feature which is surely not without some significance for the study of a clan whose history is a blank between the time of David and the post-exilic period. Moreover, it is impossible to discuss the history of the southern tribes without a careful study of the course of the southern kingdom; and in view of the *dates* of the relative sources, it is assuredly necessary to devote more consideration to such factors as the prominence of the Philistine kingdoms in the eighth century, the overthrow of Amaziah by Jehoash (and all that it entailed), or—to mention only one other event—the great revolt in the days of Jehoram.

As regards the last-mentioned, it is unnecessary to strengthen the case by referring to the book of Chronicles—whose treatment of the entire period from Jehoshaphat to Amaziah is extremely remarkable—although it is to be regretted that Meyer should so freely pour contempt upon this unfortunate but fascinating book. Valuable as Meyer's

judgements are," one hopes that in this case his verdict is not final. It is true that Meyer in uttering his opinions is in excellent company, but it appears to be overlooked that the Chronicler's characteristic religious bias does not preclude the possibility that he has rewritten or revised old tradition. As everyone knows, it is a sound principle to judge the value of a literary source, where it is the sole authority, by an estimation of its contents where it can be controlled. A number of examples of the latter show that he was wont to use the older sources with or without revision, a few (notably 2 Chron. viii. 2, xxxii. 1-8) appear to have been misunderstood (by critics), and are associated with divergent views incorporated in the earlier books. Naturally, a number of cases remain where our ignorance or the Chronicler's fallibility enter into the question. At all events, the development of tradition which is characteristic of the Chronicler occurs repeatedly in the older writings, and to dub him an "inventor of worthless phantasies," or the like, as though it was necessary to fabricate new stuff where so much old tradition must have been current, is in the highest degree unreasonable.¹ The criticisms that can be launched against his

¹ Indeed, when we observe the Chronicler's didactic treatment of material already found in Kings, it is to be inferred (on the principle stated above) that such unsupported details as 2 Chron. xxiv. 23 sqq., xxv. 14-16 are the result of manipulation of old tradition and not the work of imagination. It does not seem likely that a writer who exercised no discrimination but copied all that came under his notice (e.g. xiv. 5, xvii. 6 contrasted with xv. 17, xx. 33) could have accomplished all the feats which are commonly ascribed to him. It is hardly probable that the books of Kings and Jeremiah have preserved all that was known of the history under the monarchy, and a careful study of these is sufficient to show the extent of conflicting tradition in their age. Often where the Chronicler appears to be at fault he is working on old lines; thus 2 Chron. xxxiv. 3 (twelfth year of Josiah) is undoubtedly untrustworthy, but finds its explanation in the opening words of Jer. xxv. 3, and although 2 Chron. xiii. 7 (Rehoboam's youth) directly contradicts the earlier 1 Kings xiv. 21, judgement must be suspended in view of 1 Kings xii. 8 and the LXX. in v. 24a.

book as a whole are in every respect applicable to scattered portions of the earlier books, and whether the question be one of contemporaneousness or of genuineness, so long as these earlier books contain much which is neither contemporary nor (often) absolutely genuine, it is uncritical to ignore the traditions which the Chronicler has utilized.

In conclusion, one may be permitted to cite one case where the Chronicler's evidence cannot be absolutely rejected by consistent criticism. The fact that Libnah revolted against Jehoram when Edom threw off its allegiance (2 Kings viii. 20, 22) implies that the Philistine plain was also involved. Concerted action between the two is intelligible, and recurs in the time of the great league against Ahaz. There is nothing unreasonable, therefore, in accepting the Chronicler's representation of Uzziah's success in 2 Chronicles xxvi. 6 seq. (see 2 Kings xiv. 22), and if he replaces "Edomites" by "Arabians," this is in view of the altered circumstances after the exile. Hence he cannot be far from the truth in stating that the Philistines and "Arabians" were stirred up against Jehoram (xxi. 16), and his representation of Jehoshaphat's sovereignty (xvii. 11) is consistent therewith, and is partly implied, also, in the early fragment 1 Kings xxii. 47. Under these circumstances, it seems scarcely likely that the Chronicler, in describing the prophet who warned Jehoshaphat of impending disaster, should have "invented" the statement that the seer belonged to Mareshah. This city on account of its position would evidently be in close touch with the subsequent revolt, and the conditions help and explain its appearance in the story of Zerah the Cushite (EXPOSITOR, June, p. 541). And not only is it probable (on other grounds) that the name of the seer's father, viz. Dodavahu, is really old,¹ but it is interesting for the history of the

¹ G. B. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 232.

southern clans that one of the Chronicler's genealogies (1 Chron. ii. 42, LXX., Meyer, p. 403 seq.) styles Mareshah the "firstborn" of Caleb, and thus associates the place most intimately with the clan.

This may, perhaps, serve as an example of the way in which the Chronicler's evidence can be controlled, and may substantiate the plea that, after due allowance has been made for his *religious* tendencies, the *political* events he records are as worthy of criticism as the relatively late narratives elsewhere in the Old Testament. Obviously there comes a time when the historian has to weigh the details of the Chronicler (2 Chron. xxi. 17, for example !), but the first duty is to collect the evidence and not to reject summarily, and without careful investigation, that which, from one cause or another, appears to be worthless.

STANLEY A. COOK.

*THE JEWISH CONSTITUTION FROM NEHEMIAH
TO THE MACCABEES.*

FROM the close of the governorship of Nehemiah, about 430 B.C., to the fall of the Persian Empire, 333-331, and from this onwards under the Ptolemies to the Seleucid conquest of Palestine in 197, the history of Jerusalem is covered by an almost unbroken obscurity. Summers and winters, nearly two hundred and fifty of them, passed over the City. The spaces of sunshine, the siroccos, the clouds from the west, the great washes of rain and the usual proportion of droughts—these we can easily imagine with the constant labour of the olive, vine and corn; also the equally unceasing smoke of sacrifice from the Temple Courts, the great annual festivals, and—this is undoubted—the steady increase of the population. But it is difficult to discern either the political events or the growth of the institutions throughout the period. Yet both were of the utmost importance. The City herself was twice taken and sacked, under Artaxerxes Ochus, about 350, and by Ptolemy Soter in 320. The Law which the nation had adopted under Nehemiah became, with additions, gradually operative, and the supreme civil power was in time absorbed by the only national chief whom the Law recognized, the High Priest; while around him but beneath him there developed, out of the loosely organized body of elders and nobles, whom we have found under Nehemiah, an aristocratic council or senate, for which also there was room left by the Law. The Samaritan schism was completed and

organized, under a scarcely differing edition of the same Law. The Jews passed from the Persian beneath a Greek dominion. Even earlier than this political change, they came into direct contact with the Greeks; and we have the first impressions of them by Greek writers. After Alexander, their life began to be moulded by the Greek culture and polity; and it was from the influence of the latter upon their own ancestral customs and the precepts of their Law that the institution resulted, whose history I propose to trace in the following paper.

This study will lead us up to the controversy which has divided the scholarship of our time over the character and organization of the Great Sanhedrin. Our information about that governing body is derived from two sources: on the one hand, from the Talmud; on the other, from the Gospels and Josephus. The data which these respectively supply are conflicting; the question is, which of them we are to trust. To cite only the more recent disputants, Jewish scholars like Zunz and Grätz accept the tradition of the Talmud that the Sanhedrin was presided over, not by the High Priest, but by successive "pairs" of leaders whose names it gives; and with them Christian scholars like De Wette and Saalschutz are in agreement. On the other side, Winer, Keil and Geiger have, in contradiction to the Talmud, asserted either the usual, or the constant, presidency of the High Priest; while Jost has defended an intermediate view that the Sanhedrin enjoyed its political rights only in theory, but was prevented from putting them into practice through the usurpation of them by the High Priest and others. Another question is, When was the Sanhedrin definitely constituted? Are we with rabbinic tradition to carry this back to the days of Ezra, or with Josephus and other earlier witnesses to refuse to speak of a Senate till more than a century later? ¹The whole

subject, with its issues into New Testament times, has been admirably expounded and discussed by Kuenen in his essay on *The Composition of the Sanhedrin*.¹ His results are hostile to the Talmudic account of the Sanhedrin; for he believes that he has proved that a Sanhedrin of the type which is implied or described in the New Testament and by Josephus not only coincides with the Jewish form of government since Alexander the Great, but actually existed from at least the third century B.C.; and that the modifications which it underwent before its collapse in 70 A.D. may be stated, if not with certainty, at least with great probability. Kuenen's conclusions were generally accepted, till recently Adolf Büchler, in *The Synedrion in Jerusalem*, etc.,² offered an argument for the existence of two great tribunals in the Holy City, with separate authorities—religious and civil; and this view has been adopted by *The Jewish Encyclopædia* in its article "Sanhedrin." The whole question therefore has been reopened; and while it will not be possible in the limits of one paper to follow it into New Testament times, I may in this attempt a re-statement (with several additions) of the evidence for the earlier growth of the Jewish constitution from Nehemiah to the Maccabees. It was, after all, in this period that the looser elements of Israel's earlier polity were rearranged in the form of a more definite foundation for the institutions of the rabbinic and New Testament period, and that at least the essential outlines of the latter were developed. Yet this is the period in which the evidence has been least

¹ See Budde's Germ. ed. of Kuenen's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 49–81: "Über die Zusammensetzung des Sanhedrin." The previous literature is cited there. Useful summaries on the same lines will be found in Schürer's *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, etc., 3rd ed., 623 (Eng. trans. Div. 11, vol. i. 163–195), with additional evidence; and in Rob. Smith's art. "Synedrion" in *Encyc. Brit.*

² *Das Synedrion in Jerusalem und das Grosse Beth-Din in der Quaderkammer des Jer. Tempels*, Vienna, 1902,

carefully gathered and estimated, even by Kuenen, and that is reason enough for a new attempt at its statement and appreciation.

When Nehemiah came to Jerusalem he found among the priests, and even with the High Priest, the same unworthiness which "Malachi" imputes to them. The High Priest appears to have had no influence in the government of the City, except of an evil kind.¹ Nehemiah himself was invested with the powers of *Peḥah* or *governor* of the Jewish *mēdīneh* or *district* under the Satrap of the trans-Euphrates province of the empire. The local authorities in Jerusalem he calls *Sēgānīm* (E.V., *rulers*), *magistrates*, or *deputies*, that is of the Persian government.² They were clearly Jews, for they are reckoned in the genealogies of Israel, and charged with trespass in marrying foreign wives.³ With them are associated—or perhaps the terms are convertible—what Ezra calls the *Sārīm* (E.V. *princes*) *officers*, but Nehemiah the *Sārīm* and *Hōrīm*, nobles or *free-born* Jews, so that the whole congregation as registered and taking upon themselves the Law are said to consist of *Hōrīm*, *Seganim* and *the People*.⁴ Elsewhere, the popular assembly which gathers to discuss reforms and to ratify the Law under which it is to live, is described as *all the men of Judah and Benjamin, the Sarīm of the whole Congregation* or *Kahal*, *the people gathered as one man, the children of Israel assembled, all who had separated themselves from the peoples of the Land unto the Law of God, their wives, sons and daughters, everyone*

¹ Neh. xiii. 4 ff., 10 ff., 28 ff.; cf. Ezr. ix. 1, x. 18.

² ii. 16. The term is Assyrian and Babylonian *shaknu*—"appointed" or "instituted to an office." On the cuneiform inscriptions and in Jer. li. and Ezek. xxiii. it is applied to generals and lieutenant-governors of districts. The Greek form was ζωγάνης.

³ Neh. vii. 5, Ezr. ix. 2. Neh. v. 17 must therefore be read so as to make *Jews* and *rulers* synonymous. So the Vulgate.

⁴ Neh. vii. 5. The other references are Ezr. ix. 2; Neh. ii. 16, iv. 8 [14 Eng.], 13 [19 Eng.], v. 7, 17, vi. 17, vii. 5, ix. 38, xi. 1, xii. 31 f., 40, xiii. 11, 17.

*having knowledge and understanding, who cleave to their brethren the Horim and enter into ban and oath to walk in God's Law.*¹ Elders have been named under Darius I. and by Ezra on his arrival.²

We may, therefore, conceive of the religious authority in all religious and local affairs as emanating from the whole adult population, who had covenanted with their God to live by the Law; while from the *elders* of the *noble* or free-born families would be selected the effective magistracy, called *Sarim*, in respect that they were *princes* or *officers* over their brethren, but *Sĕganim* as being *deputies* of the Persian authority. To these would be committed the local administration of justice and other affairs in Jerusalem and the other townships. But certain *princes*, *standing for the whole congregation*, acted as a court of appeal in Jerusalem, before whom accused persons from the various towns appeared, accompanied by their local elders and judges.³ The whole system was under the power and subject to the direct interference of the Peḥah or Persian governor of the Jewish *mĕdineh*. Nehemiah also instituted two governors of the City, one of them his own brother, with the duty of appointing *watches* from among the inhabitants, and assigned to them a special police from the Levites, singers and gatekeepers of the Temple, the only classes whom, it would appear, he could thoroughly trust.⁴

I have called the whole a system, and it was under the sanction of an accepted Law, written and articulate. But these last details, and, indeed, all the records, make clear to us that for the time the system was held together and enforced largely by the personal energy of Nehemiah himself, who had no successor; and that within the covenanting

¹ Ezr. x. 1, 9, 14; Neh. viii. 1, ix. 1, x. 28.

² Ezr. v. 9 (Aram. document); x. 8; cf. 14: *elders and judges of every city*.

³ Ezr. x. 14.

⁴ Neh. vii. 1, 2.

community there were classes or factions of very different tendencies, which were bound to break loose when Nehemiah disappeared. On the one hand were the chief priestly families and some of the lay nobles, even among those lately returned from Babylonia, who were far from loyal to Nehemiah's purposes, and related themselves in marriage, or conducted correspondence, with the hostile forces outside the community. Nor were these priestly and lay factions, though thus bound by a common temptation, wholly at one among themselves; their particular interests, it is clear, must frequently have diverged. But over against the ambition and licence of both lay the stricter party devoted to the Law, either professionally, because they were its scribes and doctors, or with that real conscience for its authority which never died out of the mass of the Jewish population. Them we may consider as the more democratic party. Finally, the Law itself was not complete; we have evidence that it received additions after Nehemiah's time. Here, therefore, was not only room for such a development of the constitution as we shall see taking place; but all the materials for that controversy and struggle between factions of the community through which we may be equally sure the development proceeded.

Though the priests set their seals to the Law along with the rest of the Jews, Nehemiah assigns to them no post among the executive officers of Jerusalem, and, indeed, while the High Priest himself was traitorous to the measures of the reforming governor, there is evidence that the latter could almost as little rely on the general body of the priesthood whom "Malachi" had so unsparingly judged. But the Law, which Nehemiah and Ezra had induced the whole body of the people to accept, gave to the priesthood, and in particular to the High Priest and the branch of the tribe of Levi to which he belonged—for the office was now

hereditary—the supreme power not only over the Temple and its ritual, but over the nation as a whole. The Priestly Legislation, which was the new element introduced to the Law by Ezra, knows no king. The High Priest, to whom the earlier “Holiness-Law” ascribes a peculiar sanctity, and consecration with a crown of oil,¹ is also in the body of the Priestly Codex and its later additions *the Anointed*,² and invested with, besides the oil, the turban and the diadem.³ He stands before God an equivalent unit with the nation—*thysself and the people*⁴; his offering for his error is equal to theirs⁵; and the term of a high priest’s life determines the period during which a homicide must dwell in a city of refuge.⁶ On the other hand, the Priestly Code hardly mentions *elders*.⁷ The High Priest is to surround himself with the *princes of Israel, the heads of their fathers’ houses*, elsewhere numbered as twelve, to represent each tribe in Israel.⁸ These *něšîm* are chiefs of the thousands or clans of Israel; they are called to the Diet or Assembly; they attend the national leader and hear with him petitions; they represent the nation in engagements with other peoples.⁹ In other words, they are the same as the elders or *Sarim* of Ezra, Nehemiah, and the earlier Old Testament writings. But we must not fail to notice the higher dignity of the name given to them by the Code. It had hitherto been reserved for the supreme head of the

¹ Lev. xxi. 10–15; cf. xxi. 1–9.

² הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל: Lev. iv. 3, viii. 12; cf. Ex. 'xxix. 7; Num. xxxv. 25.

³ Ex. xxix. 6. ⁴ Lev. ix. 7, etc. ⁵ Lev. iv. 3 ff., 13 ff. ⁶ Num. xxxv. 25.

⁷ Lev. iv. 15 is really the only passage: *elders of the congregation* (עֲרֵב); for in Lev. ix. 1 the phrase is most probably an insertion by a later hand.

⁸ Num. vii. 2; cf. i. 4–16. The term *princes of Israel*, נְשִׂיִם, belongs to the later elements of the document; the body of it calls them *princes of the congregation* (עֲרֵב). Ex. xvi. 22; Num. iv. 34, xvi. 2, xxxi. 13, xxxii. 2; Josh. ix. 15, 18, xxii. 30. See Driver, *Introd.*, 132 f.; and G. B. Gray on Num. vii. 2.

⁹ For these references, see in previous note the passages on the *princes of the congregation*.

nation.¹ The change appears to represent a step in the political evolution we are following: the selection of the more notable chiefs of families to assist the High Priest in the government. But just as in the data supplied by Nehemiah there is no evidence of the incorporation of *Sarim* in a definite court or college, so with the *Princes* of the Priestly Code; though it numbers those who are to stand round Moses as twelve, and though an earlier document has spoken of the seventy elders whom Moses was bidden to take with him to the mountain and again to the door of the tabernacle.²

The Chronicler, indeed, attributes to King Jehoshaphat of Judah the institution of a definite court with double jurisdiction—secular and sacred³: *In Jerusalem did he set of the Levites and the Priests, and of the heads of the families of Israel, for the mishpat or cultus of Jahweh, and for judging the inhabitants of Jerusalem. . . .⁴ Whensoever any controversy shall come to you from your brethren that dwell in their cities between blood and blood, between law and commandment, statutes and judgments, ye shall advise them . . . and Amariah the chief priest is over you in all the matters of Jahweh; and Zebadiah the son of Ishmael, the ruler of the house of Judah, in all the king's matters, and the Levites shall be scribes or officers in your presence.* There is no doubt that the Chronicler sometimes employs ancient and reliable sources of information, not drawn upon by the editors of the Books of Kings. Is this one of them? The definiteness of the information, the division of the power between secular and sacred heads of the community (which did not exist in the Chronicler's own day) at first predis-

¹ The King (1 Kings xi. 34), Zerubbabel (Ezr. i. 8), and especially by Ezek. vii. 27, xii. 10, xlv. 7 ff., etc., etc.

² Ex. xxiv. 9; Num. xi. 16, 24: both from the Elohist.

³ 2 Chron. xix. 8-11.

⁴ With LXX. read יִשְׁבְּנוּ יְרִשְׁלָם for יִשְׁבְּנוּ יִשְׁלָם.

poses us in favour of the passage. But, on the other hand, the diction is the Chronicler's own; and we may feel sure that if an institution so basal and definite had existed before the Exile, the Books of Kings would not have failed to notice it,¹ and that at least some remnant of the Court would have survived in the days of Nehemiah. The division between the secular and sacred authority seems to exclude the theory that the passage is a mere reflection of the conditions of the Chronicler's own day, about 300 B.C.; for then, as we shall see, the High Priest presided over both the Temple and the Nation; but it might be the Chronicler's form of protesting against this monopoly and suggesting a more excellent arrangement. Otherwise it is the recollection of what really prevailed shortly after the Exile, before the High Priests had succeeded in absorbing the civil power.²

No further light is thrown on the subject by any other Old Testament writer. Joel, about 400 B.C., and the author of "Zechariah" ix.-xiv. some eighty years later, are too engrossed with disasters to the land, physical and political, and too hurried into Apocalypse to give thought to the institutions of their City. The *assembly of the congregation* which Joel summons is only for worship. Consequently our next witness is a Greek, the first of Greeks to have any real information about Jerusalem. Hecataeus of Abdera, about 300 B.C.,³ reports that "the Jews have never had a king, but committed the presidency of the people throughout to that one of the priests who was reputed to excel in wisdom and virtue; him they call Chief Priest, and consider him to be the messenger to them of the commands of God. It is he who in the *ecclesiæ* and

¹ Cf. Wellhausen, *ProL*. 191 (Eng. tr.).

² Büchler (pp. 72f. n. 1) seeks to analyze the passage, and judging verse 8 as a disturbance in the context, takes it as a later addition.

³ Quoted in a fragment of Diodorus Siculus: Müller, *Fragm. Historiæ Græcorum*, ii. 391.

other synods transmits the precepts or orders.”¹ The Jews prostrate themselves before this “interpreting chief priest. Moses chose the most genial and able men to preside over the nation, and appointed them as priests” for the service of the Temple, but also “as judges in the most serious cases, and entrusted with the care of the laws and morals.” He adds that, while all the citizens had the national territory distributed to them by lot, “the lots of the priests were the greater, in order that they might enjoy the more considerable revenues, and so give themselves without distraction to the worship of the Deity.” Here are some glimmerings of a regular court of priests, not only presided over by the High Priest, but subject to his absolute power in the communication and interpretation of the Divine will. Like other Greek writers upon the Jews, Hecataeus was probably blinded by the prominence of the national worship and priesthood to the share taken by the laity in the conduct of affairs. This, as we have seen, was considerable, and it was secured to the *princes*, the *heads of the clans*, by the Priestly Legislation.

The next evidence may be taken from the Septuagint translation of the Law, which was made in the third century. Sometimes this renders *elders* and *princes* by their Greek equivalents—*presbyteroi* and *archontes* or *archēgoi*; but sometimes also by the collective term *Gerousia*² or *Senate*; and translates the description of them as *summoned to the Diet* by the phrase *called together to the Boulē* or *Council*.³

In the Letter of *Aristeas to Philokrates*, we have not, as it pretends, the testimony of a Greek ambassador from

¹ παραγγελλόμενα.

² Γερουσία (Ex. xxiv. 1; Lev. ix. 1): of the elders of the nation; and always, save once, in Deut. xix. 12, xxi. 2-4, 6, 19, xxii. 15-18, xxv. 7-9; the Γερουσία τῆς πόλεως. In xxi. 20 for *elders* it reads *men*.

³ כִּנְיָרִי אֶלְדֵּרִי, σύνκλητοι βουλῆς (Num. xvi. 2).

Ptolemy Philadelphus (286–247) to the High Priest at Jerusalem ; but the work, before 200, of a Jewish writer well acquainted with the City and the Land.¹ He represents Ptolemy as treating with the High Priest alone, and describes the power and splendour of the latter, “the ruling chief priest,” in terms which recall those of Hecataeus of Abdera. The other constituents of the population whom he mentions are the host of priests, the temple servants ; the responsible and carefully selected garrison of the Akra, which, “standing on a very lofty spot and fortified with many towers, dominated the localities about the Temple” ; and the citizens.²

Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, about 180 B.C., sheds little light on the forms of the government of Jerusalem ; his spirit is more concerned with their moral influence. It was *Simon the son of Johanan the priest, great one of his brethren*,³ and the glory of his people, who, by repairing and fortifying the Temple, making a reservoir and building a wall, *took thought for his people against the spoiler, and strengthened his City against siege*.⁴ His glory in his robes at the altar, surrounded by the sons of Aaron in their glory, the choir and all the people of the land, who bowed down before him as he blessed them, is vividly described.⁵ The *congregation* or *assembly* is mentioned under both its Hebrew names, and in one case is called the *congregation of the gate*⁶ ; associated both by this name

¹ Swete, *Introd. to the O.T. in Greek*, 10–16. The text of the letter itself, edited with introd. by H. St. J. Thackeray, will be found in the Appendix, 499–574.

² The High Priest : 518, 521, 525–527, 533–536 ; the citizens : 518, 527 ; the other priests and temple servants : 534–536 ; the Akra and garrison : 537 of the above edition. Ruling chief priest τοῦ προστατούντος ἀρχιερέως, 533—last two lines.

³ L. 1. So the Hebrew. The Greek has *the great priest*.

⁴ L. 1–4. I have followed the Hebrew.

⁵ 5 ff.

⁶ Both עדה *סυναγωγῇ* and קהלה *ἐκκλησία* : iv. 7 and vii. 7 (עדת יִשְׂרָאֵל).

and otherwise with judicial processes.¹ The *congregation* is also equivalent to *the people*.² There are *elders*,³ *great men of the people*, and *leaders of the city or of the ecclesia*,⁴ *dynasts* or men in power,⁵ and *judges* whom the Hebrew calls *rulers*.⁶ It is evident from more than one passage that the man most in the way of promotion to these dignities is the scribe.⁷ Among the worst evils to be feared in Jerusalem are the *slander of the town*, *mob-law* and *false accusation*.⁸ On the whole, the Son of Sirach may be said to write from a democratic position, and in a popular temper, but with special emphasis on his own profession, the Scribes.

Such is the literary evidence as to the government of the City and Nation, belonging to the period itself. I turn now to the later histories. It is in this very period, towards the end of the third century B.C., that Jewish historians begin to speak of a *Gerousia* or *Senate* beside the High Priest. Josephus gives a letter of Antiochus the Great (233–187), in which the King reports that on his approach to Jerusalem the Jews came out to meet him with their *Gerousia*, and that he discharged the *Gerousia*, the priests, the Temple scribes, and the sacred singers from all taxes.⁹ The Second Book of Maccabees states that the *Gerousia* sent three men to Antiochus Epiphanes in 170, and quotes a letter from Antiochus of date 164, addressed to the *Gerousia of the Jews* and *the other Jews*.¹⁰ The First Book

¹ xxiii. 24, and especially xxxviii. 33. The adulterer too is punished in *the broad places of the city*, xxiii. 21.

² xxxiii. 18 [19], xlv. 15, l. 20.

³ vi. 34: not in the Hebrew.

⁴ *μεγιστᾶνες* (also found in LXX.), Heb. שׁלטן iv. 7, xxxiii. 18 [19], and ἡγούμενοι, x. 2. xxxiii. 18 [19].

⁵ x. 3: *δυναστῶν*.

⁶ x. 2: *κριτῆς* שׁוֹפֵט.

⁷ x. 5, xxxviii. 24–xxxix. 11.

⁸ *Διαβολὴν πόλεως καὶ ἐκκλησίαν ὄχλου καὶ καταψευσμον*: xxvi. 5.

⁹ Jos. xii. *Ant.* iii. 3.

¹⁰ 2 Macc. iv. 44, xi. 27.

of Maccabees speaks at first only of *rulers and elders* in Israel¹; but of the letter, which it quotes, sent to the Spartans about 144, the superscription runs: *Jonathan the High Priest, and the Gerousia of the nation, and the priests and the rest of the people of the Jews*.² The formal inscription of the people's gratitude to Simon is stated as follows: *In the third year [139] of Simon the High Priest, and Prince of the People of God (?) in a great congregation of priests and people and rulers of the nation*.³

From all this evidence, we may reasonably conclude that the formation of a definite Synod or Senate at Jerusalem came about in the following manner. *First*, as the High Priest, whose rank was hereditary, increased in civil power, partly no doubt by the absence of a Persian governor in Jerusalem, partly by the great ability of some holders of the office, but chiefly with the support of the large priesthood and under the influence of the Law instituted by Nehemiah, he would seek to fortify his office by a council not only of his own profession and family, but of the leaders of the foremost lay families, the *elders* of the nation, or of those of them who, as *Sarim and Seganim*, had vested rights to official positions, and were recognized as *Princes* or *Něsí'im* under the Law; and it would be in his own interest, as well as conformable to the tendency of the Law, to have their eligibility, their number and their functions clearly defined. As for the number, the Law afforded precedents: the *seventy elders* and the *twelve princes of Israel*. No doubt there were many struggles between the priests on the one side and the laity on the other. The High Priest was the Anointed; and among a people so

¹ 1 Macc. i. 26. The date it refers to is 168 B.C.

² xii. 6; cf. verse 35, *the elders of the people*; cf. xiii. 36: *the elders and nation of the Jews*; xiv. 20: *high priest, elders, priests and residue of the people*.

³ xiv. 27 ff.; for *εν Σαραμει* read perhaps *וישר עם אל*.

absorbed in worship, whose only legal temple was itself a citadel within their capital, the impression of his sacred rank and splendour as he performed the rites, no less than of his material power, must have been, as several of our witnesses testify, overpowering. On the other hand, there were the long established rights of the heads of the chief lay families to a voice in affairs; and behind this the splendid consciousness, which, as we shall see, Israel never lost, that the ultimate source of authority was the people itself—the whole congregation of the faithful. How far the struggles between these forces were crossed and disturbed by political crises, such as the disasters to the City, we have no means of knowing; but it is extremely probable that such crises would give now one faction and now the other the advantage. On the whole, as we see from our witnesses, the High Priest kept his supremacy, but not without a considerable power being reserved to the nobles. Josephus accurately describes the general result as a form of government that was aristocratic, but mixed with an oligarchy, for the chief priests were at the head of affairs.¹ All this was probable during the century between Nehemiah and the close of the Persian period.

But, *secondly*, there arose in Palestine from the invasion of Alexander the Great onwards an increasing number of Greek cities, each with its democratic council, and the example of these, along perhaps with the advice or pressure of the Greek sovereigns of Judæa, cannot but have told on the institutions of the Jews, who, whether willing or unwilling, became more and more subject to Hellenic influence. Kuenen, indeed, gives a somewhat different explanation in the goodwill towards the Jews of the Ptolemies, their masters during the third century, as contrasted with the smaller amount of independence vouch-

¹ xi. *Ant.* iv. 8.

safed them by the Persians. This contrast is by no means so certain as he assumes. In Nehemiah's time, at least, the Jews had as much favour shown them by the Persian king as would have permitted the formation of an organized Senate had other influences led to the creation of this. The interested kindness of the Ptolemies may have provided the opportunity, but it is more probable that the real stimulus came from the example of the Greek or Hellenized towns in Palestine. The names which are given to the new institution are Greek: *Gerousia* and *Boulē*.

In any case, by the end of our period there was associated with the High Priest in the government of the nation a definite Senate, composed of priests, scribes and the heads of families, which in the name of the nation conducted negotiations with foreign powers. That they are regarded by the First Book of Maccabees¹ as equivalent to the *elders and rulers* of the people there can be little doubt. Therefore we may impute to them as well other administrative functions and the supreme judicial power, and this is confirmed by the Septuagint's use of *Gerousia*.

From the facts that some of our witnesses do not use the term *Gerousia*, and that those who do nowhere record the creation of a Senate, nor offer a definition or statistics of it, the argument might reasonably be urged that the writers who speak of a *Gerousia* of the Jews are only following the fashion to which Jews were prone of giving Greek names, often far from appropriate, to their own institutions. This is a possible explanation, but I do not feel that it is adequate. The Jewish constitution, it is true, was not Hellenized to the same extent as those of surrounding Semitic states.²

¹ See above.

² Gustav Höschler, *Palästina in der persischen u. hellenist. Zeit*, p. 68, has gone too far when he concludes that "Jerusalem was also ranged in the Hellenistic organization of the land," and that, along with its territory it may well have been called a *νομός*. He founds this opinion

The City of Jerusalem never received, like others in Palestine, a Greek name; she kept her own religion and was governed by her own High Priest. But with this seclusion the formation of a definite senate, in imitation of Greek models, was perfectly compatible, and I feel that, on the whole, the evidence I have cited is in favour of the fact that such a Senate was actually formed.

There were, of course, local courts as well. The elders of each township continued to sit in its gates, as of old and as sanctioned by the Law. It is perhaps to such a burgh-court in Jerusalem that the Son of Sirach alludes as the *Congregation of the Gate, the leaders of the City*.¹ In that case, the supreme court may have been the burgh-court as well. Unfortunately, the data of the Son of Sirach are ambiguous. The only other gathering for judgment which he mentions is one of the whole people, who are also mentioned as a whole in the lists of national authorities in the First Book of Maccabees. There is no trace as yet of a select body of leaders distinct from the Gerousia, and possessing only spiritual or religious authority.² Such a division of jurisdiction would have been contrary to the principle, which runs through the Jewish Law, of the identity of the secular and the sacred. That the *Gerousia* divided itself, as the Chronicler asserts of Jehoshaphat's supreme court, into—not two courts, but—two different kinds of sessions, one to deal with religious matters, and one with sacred, is, of course, possible. But upon the evidence we have from the period, it is as impossible to separate (as he does) the High Priest's supremacy from the secular as from the sacred cases. We must also note that in religious matters

(p. 74) on the supposition that Judæa is intended as the fourth of the four nomoi mentioned in 1 Macc. xi. 57. More probably this is Ekron, cf. x. 89.

¹ x. 2.

² As argued in the *Jewish Encycl.*, art. "Sanhedrin,"

not priests only, but scribes, had already a great and a growing influence.

These are all the antecedents which our period has to offer to the appearance in the next period of the Great Synedrion or Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, the name of which at least first appears towards the middle of the first century before Christ.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

*MELITO THE AUTHOR OF THE MURATORIAN
CANON.*

SCHOLARS must be grateful to the Rev. T. H. Robinson for his paper on the authorship of the ancient and enigmatic list of New Testament writings, known as the Muratorian Canon. Once more, too, we have to congratulate Dr. Rendel Harris for being a link in the chain of causes bringing within our reach fresh material for the solution of an old problem. But while sensible of the value of Mr. Robinson's paper as a contribution to the subject, I am not convinced that he has succeeded in identifying the author of what is probably the earliest orthodox New Testament Canon known to us, when he argues anew for Hippolytus, and so virtually for a date at least as late as 200 A.D.

At first sight the new point of contact between the Canon and Hippolytus, supplied by Bar Şalibi, somewhat shook my confidence in another theory of authorship which had been defining itself to my mind for some time past. Yet, on closer examination, it failed to establish Bishop Lightfoot's view as restated by Mr. Robinson, and fitted quite naturally into the theory which it is the aim of this paper to develop.

Mr. Robinson sums up his conclusions as follows :—

1. The identity of the *Chapters against Gaius* with the *Apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John*.¹ Incidentally we may regard it as proved that Gaius really existed

2. The free use made by Epiphanius of the *Chapters against Gaius*.

3. The fact that the Muratorian Canon is the work of Hippolytus.

¹ The exact title in the list of Hippolytus' works on the pedestal of his statue, is *On behalf of the Gospel according to John and (the) Apocalypse*.

“These results,” he says, “may be held to be certain.” As agreeing with the first two, but holding the third to be both unproved and improbable, I have re-arranged them in an order corresponding to the cogency of the evidence. As to the fourth result, that “the Muratorian Canon stood at or near the beginning of the treatise against Gaius,” it of course depends entirely on the third, and must share its lot.

As regards Hippolytus’ authorship of the Muratorian Canon, all turns on the following parallelism, so far as it extends, which may be exhibited most clearly by juxtaposition of the statements in question.

| BAR ŞALIBI. | MURATORIAN CANON. |
|---|--|
| <i>John to the Seven Churches</i> | * * * |
| <i>which are in Asia.</i> . . . Hippolytus says that, in writing to seven churches, he writes just as Paul wrote thirteen letters but wrote them to seven churches. | Since the blessed Apostle Paul himself, following the method (<i>ordinem</i>) of his predecessor John, writes only to seven individual churches, ¹ . . . |

Here it is seen at once that, while Hippolytus makes John write as Paul wrote, the Canon reverses the comparison and makes John’s action the model of Paul’s. Not only so; but the Canon’s way of putting the matter is obviously prior in thought. For it requires some reflection to notice that Paul’s *public* letters are in fact addressed to seven churches (his private ones are also referred to in the Canon, though not by Hippolytus as reported by Bar Şalibi); whereas John’s address to seven churches—and that

¹ De quibus (sc. Epistolis) singulis necesse est a nobis disputari, cum ipse beatus apostolus Paulus sequens prodecessoris sui Johannis ordinem non nisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat. . . . Una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse dinoscitur, et Johannes enim in Apocalypsi, licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit.

in unity, as representing the Church generally—at once strikes the attention. These observations suggest that Hippolytus is adapting an earlier comparison of the procedure of these two Apostles, for the special purpose of refuting by appeal to the usage of the Apostle Paul (whose writings Gaius received) the notion that John was not the author of the Apocalypse. In so doing, he makes the comparison inaccurate in form, by referring to all Paul's thirteen epistles as written to seven churches. What is common to the two passages in their respective contexts, is simply the idea that both in John and Paul *the unity of the Church Catholic* underlay an Apostle's writing to *seven* distinct churches. This is what one church writer would naturally borrow from another. But in no case can Bar Şalibi be citing the passage in the Muratorian Canon, which therefore cannot have stood near the beginning of Hippolytus' *Chapters against Gaius* on behalf of the Gospel and Apocalypse of John.

Further, when we reflect on it, there would be no fitness in a list of New Testament writings standing at the head of a work dealing simply with two Johannine writings. On the other hand, it would be quite precarious to assume that it was in another of his works that Hippolytus made an inverted and less accurate use of an analogy he had himself originated, between John's and Paul's letters to seven churches. In this connexion Mr. Robinson himself argues that the *Chapters against Gaius* "being the only work of Hippolytus which we have found in Bar Şalibi's hands, the law of parsimony of causes compels us to attribute all quotations from this author to the same document, unless we have some fairly strong evidence to the contrary. And an examination of the evidence seems to lead to a conclusion which confirms our first impression." This result he strengthens yet further in the sequel, by showing from a comparison of parallel matter in Epiphanius, that Bar

Ṣalibi's quotation from Hippolytus touching Cerinthus comes also from the *Chapters against Gaius*. But since our author tries to show that this quotation itself establishes so close a relation between the *Chapters against Gaius* and the Muratorian Canon as to point to unity of authorship, if not identity between the two, we must go into this matter a little further. This is the more needful, that the argument here seems to rest on a misreading of the meaning of a clause in the Canon.

After saying that the Epistles of Paul "themselves declare, for those wishful to gather it, *which* were sent to a given place,¹ and for what cause," the Canon proceeds to illustrate its statement from the four longest of Paul's letters (*prolixius scripsit*): "first of all to the Corinthians, forbidding sectarian schism (*schisma hæresis*, MSS. *scysmæ*(e) and *scisma*); afterwards to the Galatians, (forbidding) circumcision; to the Romans, moreover, intimating the method (*ordinem*) of the Scriptures, but also that their root-principle (*principium*=*ἀρχή*) is Christ."

In this passage Mr. Robinson would take *ordo* as the equivalent of *κανών*; whereas it clearly means "method," "ordered plan," as just below,² where Paul is said to follow John's *ordo* in writing to seven churches individually. Thus the phrase contains no reference to the "canonicity of certain books of Scripture," along with "Christology" alluded to in the ensuing words. Rather it contains two sides of a single idea, viz., that an ordered plan of gradual revelation runs through the Old Testament Scriptures, which receives its full explanation and justification in Christ, who is presupposed throughout. To this topic (as to the two others just named) the writer calls special attention, pre-

¹ *A quo loco* must surely be a copyist's error for *ad quem locum*.

² Also a few lines above, "*sed et (se) scriptorem omnium mirabilium domini per ordinem profitetur*" (sc. *Johannes*).

sumably as meeting some current error, no doubt that of Marcion, to whose heresy he refers a little lower down as being supported by certain supposititious Pauline epistles, and again when ruling out a whole group of false claimants to canonical standing. This explained, the specific references which Mr. Robinson sees in the Canon, to Corinthian errors, fade away. We have simply to remember, in trying to identify the author of the Canon, that he writes in a region where schismatic heresy, circumcision, and polemic against the Old Testament Scriptures as not really Christian in principle, are living issues.

Let us now start afresh on the internal indications in the Muratorian Canon.

(1) Its dominant interest—and this, alone, is fatal to the view that it belongs to the *Chapters against Gaius*—is plainly the Church Catholic and its common faith as embodied in and guaranteed by the four Gospels and other Apostolic writings, particularly the Pauline Epistles. Its whole concern is with the “Canon” of the New Testament, as norm of the Church’s faith and practice, and the exact limits of such a “Canon” as fixed by the general usages of the “Catholic Church.”

(2) Next, it betrays a special interest in and familiarity with the Johannine writings, without any tendency to let these overshadow the Pauline Epistles. The Apocalypse is referred to twice; once as yielding a precedent for the varied local destinations of the Pauline writings, and both times without any suspicion that its genuineness or authority calls for any vindication.¹

But it is on the Johannine Gospel; the authoritative conditions of its origin; and the solemn assurance with

¹ It is strange that our author should have overlooked this almost insuperable objection to the theory he puts forward.

which its apostolic author is at pains in his Epistle to asseverate his eye and ear witness to the wonders of the Lord's life as manifest among men—it is on all this that the Canon lays peculiar stress. Surely these phenomena point to an origin in the region where John had lived and taught, and where we know that he left an abiding influence, in what Lightfoot has called “the School of St. John” in Asia. What, then, could be more natural than to look for its author among the greater names of “the later School of St. John,” in the generation after Papias and Polycarp—men like Melito of Sardis, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and, somewhat later, Polycrates of Ephesus?

(3) We have just mentioned Papias. A third feature of our Canon is its close affinities with that Asiatic churchman. The opening words of its mutilated beginning seem an echo of what he says touching Mark and his limitations as a Gospel writer. But the resemblance ¹ goes deeper, extending to the apologetic motive underlying its references to the Gospels as a whole. As in Papias' day, so in our writer's, the formal differences of the evangelic records on which all ordinary Christians relied, as distinct from “Gnostic” and boldly interpretative spirits, were being magnified to the prejudice of their great common elements. But it is no longer, as with Papias, the substantial identity of the Lord's teaching in his “Oracles” (*Logia*), as recorded in the Church's Gospels, e.g. our Matthew or Mark, that is emphasized over against impugnors of their authority. The Lord's Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, intercourse

¹ It extends even to minor points of detail, which yet are suggestive of abiding local usage. Thus we read: “Quantum evangelium Johannis ex discipulis. Cohortantibus condiscipulis, etc.” Here the category “disciples,” rather than “apostles,” applied to John and his fellow-witnesses of their Master's life, recalls Papias' point of view and points to a mannerism in the Asiatic churches: cf. John's Gospel, especially the closing chapters, e.g. xxi. 20, 23 f.

with His disciples, His twofold Advent—first in despised humility, but one day in glorious regal power—these are now the points on which stress is laid, as being the concordant testimony of the Church's four Gospels in virtue of "one controlling Spirit" (*uno principalī spiritu, ἐνὶ ἡγεμονικῷ πνεύματι*). This is not accidental; the points affirmed are the echoes of points denied; and in the denials we can hear again, above all else, the accents of Marcion of Pontus, in whom not only Polycarp saw "the first-born of Satan," but Dionysius of Corinth probably recognized the most influential of the aberrant teachers whom he was called to combat by his letters (c. 160–70 A.D.).

It is of no small interest, then, to remember that Melito is distinctly stated by Anastasius of Sinai to have written against Marcion, who by his docetism attacked the true humanity of Christ.¹

(4) But once more, a point on which our writer is obviously most sensitive is any spurious claim to "prophetic" inspiration. This explains his discriminating attitude to the *Shepherd* of Hermas, the "very recent" origin of which "in our own times" (*nuperrime temporibus nostris*²), during the tenure of "the see of the city of Rome" by Pius (c. 140–55 A.D.), he carefully records.³ This work he thinks entitled by the fact that its author was brother of the said Pius, and that it came with the prestige of the great Church

¹ See Lightfoot, *Essays on "Supernatural Religion,"* 230 f.

² Surely a date about 150 A.D., or earlier, could hardly be so alluded to by Hippolytus, writing not before 200 A.D., and perhaps at least a decade later.

³ In this connexion it may be well to meet an argument sometimes put forward in favour of the Roman *provenance* of the Muratorian Canon, viz., that such accurate knowledge can only have been enjoyed locally. To many this explicit account, as less needful on the spot touching a work of the last generation at most, will suggest just the opposite; viz., careful information as to a matter of authorship and origin which was not likely to be within common local knowledge, but which bore upon a problem of great local moment, like "prophets" and "prophetic writings" in Asia.

of Rome, to be read indeed with respect, but not in public worship side by side with the "prophets, (now) complete in number, and the Apostles."

It hardly needs the reference to "the founder of the Cataphrygians," three or four lines lower down, as among heretical writers, to suggest that Montanism was a special danger in the region where this Canon first saw light.¹ But Montanism was largely confined to Asia until after c. 180 A.D., and even later; while everything² we have seen about our document points to a date before rather than after 180 A.D. Here again Melito comes to mind, since he flourished under Marcus Aurelius, and among his works we hear of one apparently anti-Montanist in tendency, "On conduct and prophets" (περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν), i.e. on the sort of conduct befitting prophets, a matter on which the Montanists were sharply criticized.

(5) Finally, from this point of view we get the best explanation of the strange circumstance that John is described as Paul's "predecessor" in the use of the method (*ordo*) of writing to seven churches as symbolic of the Church's perfect unity in variety. As the reference is to John as the writer of the Apocalypse, it can only mean that this writing is thought of as prior at least to the completion of the Pauline cycle of epistles. This is inconceivable in Hippolytus, who, as Bar Şalibi observes, agreed with Irenæus in believing that the Apocalypse was "seen" about

¹ *Assianom* (= *Asianum*) before *Catafrycum constitutorem* is probably a Latin gloss for the readers' sake. In the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April last (vii. 457 f.) Dom Morin shows reason for suspecting that Victorinus of Pettau († 304) was the translator of the Murat. Canon. According to Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* 74, Victorinus was more at home in Greek than Latin, which would quite suit the case.

² Add the absence of all reference either to Hebrews or 1 Peter, neither of which could be reserved, as Mr. Robinson suggests, for mention (out of their proper place) after the heretical writings amidst which the present text of the Canon breaks off.

the end of Domitian's reign. In any case, however we may explain the idea—which, by the by, favours an early rather than a late date for our Canon—it could hardly arise save in a region where the Johannine tradition was even stronger than the Pauline. There only could the notion of making John the norm of fitting action readily occur, without the chronological question, too, needing to be considered very seriously.

With such presumptions in mind, making strongly for authorship in provincial Asia during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–80 A.D.), we may profitably consider the following passage from Lightfoot's essay¹ on "The Later School of St. John."

"Asia Minor appears to have been far in advance of the other Churches of Christendom in literary activity during the second century. . . . The productiveness of the Asiatic Christians in this respect was doubtless stimulated by the pressure of opposition. This region was the hotbed of heresies, and the arena of controversy. Nor is it unimportant to observe that the main subjects of discussion were of such a kind as must necessarily have involved questions intimately connected with the Canon. Montanism, with its doctrine of the Paraclete and its visions of the New Jerusalem, would challenge some expression of opinion respecting the Gospel and the Apocalypse of St. John, if these writings were disputed. The Paschal controversy courted investigation into the relations between the narratives of the Synoptists and the Fourth Evangelist.² Mar-

¹ *Essays on "Supernatural Religion,"* p. 219.

² Observe, in this connexion, the emphasis laid by our Canon on the fact that John's Gospel, written last and in view of the Synoptics, had the joint sanction of all surviving personal disciples of Christ, including the Apostle Andrew (*ut recognoscentibus cunctis Johannes suo nomine cuncta describeret*). Thus, although the various Gospels begin at different points (*et ideo, licet varia singulis evangeliorum libris principia doceantur*), yet this makes no difference to the faith of believers, since by one guiding

cionism, resting as it did on the paramount and sole authority of St. Paul's Epistles and of the Pauline Gospel, would not suffer friend or foe to preserve silence on this fundamental question.¹ And so again, though in a less degree, the disputes with Cerinthians, with Ophites, with Basilideans, with Valentinians,² with all the various sects of Gnostics, could not have been conducted, as we see plainly from the treatises of Irenæus and Hippolytus, without constant appeals to the testimony of written documents—thus indicating, at all events roughly, the amount of authority which the writers accorded to the more prominent books of our New Testament Canon."

On this single passage, written without reference to the Muratorian Canon and by one who was later to be the protagonist for its Hippolytean origin, one may safely stake the case for the Asian school of St. John as the home of this first sketch of the Church's virtual Canon of New Testament Scriptures, over against both Marcionism and Montanism. It is put forth in a tentative and informal manner, as befits a date before Irenæus published his more elaborate handling of the same class of problems as are here

Spirit all things are in all declared, touching the Nativity, etc. (see above, p. 216, for the list).

¹ Does not this suggest the ultimate reason of the form in which the Canon refers to the Pauline Epistles and their conformity to John's precedent? It looks as though it were the implicit reply to a Marcionite plea, that the Pauline Epistles do not contemplate such "rigid uniformity" of creed and practice as the Church of that day opposed to Marcion's views, for which he probably claimed a Pauline "liberty" in keeping with the varied tenor of his letters to his churches, with their several local differences in faith and practice. When Marcion invited Polycarp to "recognize him" as a fellow-Christian, he may have had this idea in mind.

² Reference is made to these two leading types of *gnosis* in our Canon, as those most dangerous through writings of weight, side by side with Marcionism; whereas Cerinthus' distinctive position was probably no longer any particular menace, nor does he seem to have been represented by writings that could rival the Church's Scriptures.

implied. Let any one but read through the Canon afresh with Lightfoot's words in mind, asking himself "Why are things put just as they are?" and he can hardly fail to feel that "correspondence with environment" which is the mark of vital relation between a document and its original *habitat*. But further, the same essay of Lightfoot's contains much that points to Melito as the actual author. Overlapping, by some forty years or more, with Polycarp, bishop of the adjacent Smyrna, "Melito is a significant link of connexion with the past. At the same time he holds an equally important position with respect to the succeeding age. . . . It may be suspected that he was the very Ionian whom Clement of Alexandria mentions among his earlier teachers.¹ It is quite certain that his writings were widely known and appreciated in the generations next succeeding his own. He is quoted or referred to by Polycrates at Ephesus, by Clement and Origen at Alexandria, by Tertullian at Carthage, by Hippolytus at Rome" (p. 224).

The last reference is particularly suggestive in helping to explain anything that may need direct literary explanation, as touching ideas found alike in the Muratorian Canon and in Hippolytus; for instance, the analogy between John's and Paul's Epistles to seven churches, on which Mr. Robinson leans the whole weight of his theory. It may also help us to decide for Melito rather than a contemporary, like Apollinaris of Hierapolis, in so far as we can infer any literary connexion between Hippolytus and this passage in the Canon. For we do not know of Apollinaris having anything like the same influence outside Asia, at any rate in the West, as Melito, touching whom Hippolytus exclaims (Euseb. v. 28), "Who is ignorant of the books both of Irenæus and

¹ May he not have been Clement's primary (oral) authority for the similar account of the origin of the Fourth Gospel to that in our Canon, given as "a tradition of the elders of an earlier age" (*παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν περὶ βυτέρων*, *Hypotyposes* ap. Euseb. vi. 14) ?

Melito and the rest, books proclaiming the divinity and humanity of Christ? ” Polycrates’ testimony to Melito is also worth quoting, as bearing on his general attitude to the Church’s faith. Writing to Victor of Rome about 190 A.D., he speaks of Melito as “ having lived his life in all things as one inspired ” (τὸν ἐν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευόμενον) ; and then ranks him among those who “ kept the 14th day as that of the Passover according to the Gospel, in no respect deviating, but following the rule of (the) faith ” (κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες, Eus. v. 24). Is not this just the type of man from whom we should expect a pioneer attempt to define the standard of the Church’s faith, its “ Canon ” in the original sense of norm or objective standard? We know that he was at great pains to define accurately the contents of the Old Testament¹ Canon of Scripture, journeying to Palestine on purpose. Who, then, so likely to concern himself with an analogous problem, when it was pressed upon the churches of Asia, and that before any others in Christendom?

It is one thing to identify Melito as author of the first informal New Testament Canon from the orthodox side, in answer both to Marcion’s minimum or Pauline Canon and to the Montanist’s tendency in the other direction, that of including recent “ prophetic ” writings.² It is quite another to name the work of his in which it may have stood.

Eusebius, who gives us a long list (iv. 26), quotes the

¹ Westcott pointed out, and Lightfoot (so too Harnack) supported his view when it was challenged by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, that when Melito refers to his friend Onesimus’ desire “ to be accurately informed about the ancient books ” (τὴν τῶν παλαιῶν βιβλίων. . . ἀκρίβειαν), his language suggests the correlative notion of a collection of writings standing to the New Testament as the others to the Old.

² How strong this tendency was in Asia, even beyond Montanist circles, appears from the fact that Tertullian twits the orthodox with the remark that Melito himself was by very many of them considered a prophet (Jerome, *De Vir. ill.* 24).

preface to one of them, the *Eclogæ* or Selections from Scripture, at the beginning of which occurs "a catalogue of the acknowledged Scriptures of the Old Testament," to which reference has just been made. Is it not most natural to suppose that, in complying with the request of his friend Onesimus to supply him with "Selections both from the Law and the Prophets, touching our Saviour and all our Faith," Melito took occasion to complete his proof of the contents of the Church's faith touching the Saviour, by referring to the newer sacred writings (as indicated by use in public worship)? For these set forth the fulfilment of all foreshadowed in the "Ancient" Scriptures on such matters. Indeed, is not this very much what the Canon has in mind in alluding to the "method of the Scriptures, and that Christ is their fundamental principle," as the theme of Paul's Epistle to the Romans?

We may hazard the conjecture, then, that somewhere in Melito's *Selections*, perhaps in the Preface¹ and as the analogue suggested by the authorized list of Old Testament books, there stood originally a list of New Testament books authorized by habitual reading in the churches of provincial Asia, in which the κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός or "rule of faith," subjectively held in the Church's living belief, recognized its objective norm or κανὼν. Such a Canon was meant to define the exact limits within which the teaching of Christ and of His apostles on the things of faith was to be sought, and by which it was to be tested and proved in the face of aberrant views.

If so, it is in Melito that the idea of an objective collection of New Testament writings *exclusive of all others*, after the manner of the Old Testament, emerges for the first time.

¹ Compare Batiffol's remark in *La Littérature grecque*, p. 24: "The style makes one think neither of a Canon, nor of a treatise, but rather of an epistle."

and that at the very date singled out by Harnack on general grounds for the rise of a distinct conception of the Canon as such—a conception due in the first instance to the practical need of defining what was of faith, as distinct from heresy. And as the need first became acute in Asia, and not in Rome, so there, and not in Rome, first arose the answering consciousness of the practical supply ready to hand among the riches of the Christian heritage, as the process of clear differentiation between sacred writings of various degrees of authority there took effect. Harnack seems essentially right in his emphasis on the specific novelty of this conception of an exclusive objective Canon, and on its relatively “sudden” emergence (about 170 A.D.)—after all qualifications are admitted and all misunderstandings¹ of his meaning are removed. On the other hand, if the Asian origin of the Muratorian Canon be admitted, it will involve a restatement of Harnack’s theory that it was in Rome that such a Canon received its first structure. In this light the Roman type—with the Acts and the writings of the original Apostles at the centre, and the Gospels on the one wing and the Pauline Epistles on the other—must be held to be secondary and a modification of the fundamental Asian type seen in our Canon. *The suggestion*, in this, as in other cases, reached Rome from outside; but it was adopted by Roman practical intelligence and also adapted to local feeling. To these 1 Peter was dear, while the Pauline Epistles were in general less congenial than such writings of the other original Apostles as were in local use. In a word, the Asian theory of our document seems to fit into the history of the Canon in the second century like a key-stone into the arch, consolidating the whole construction.

Reviewing our discussion as a whole, and changing the

¹ E.g. even in Dr. Sanday’s most judicious discussion of Harnack’s view in his Bampton Lecture on *Inspiration*, pp. 12 ff. and 61–63.

metaphor, this theory seems to fit too many wards of a highly complex lock to be other than the true key. Certainly it has opened up the allusive meaning of various expressions in the Muratorian Canon to the present writer's mind, as he proceeded to apply it, in a way that causes him to hope that it may commend itself to others also in like fashion. To locate more accurately an early Christian witness of such obvious significance, but of enigmatic origin, is to enhance its potential value to a degree that can only be realized by actual experience. But even though this paper may not lead to the ultimate supersession of the accidental label "Canon of Muratori" by the historically significant title "Canon of Melito"; it will be something gained, if the Hippolytean origin be henceforth considered an exploded hypothesis, and the true path be indicated by the setting up of some fresh finger-posts to the final truth.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

ABOUT 190 years before the Christian era, one Jesus Ben-Sira produced a book of sage counsel and godly exhortation, which found acceptance, first in Jewry and afterwards in Christendom, as a work profitable to be read "for example of life and instruction of manners." This book, however, was not admitted into the Jewish Canon of "Holy Writ." Some twenty-five years later (so we are called upon to believe) appeared an anonymous work, purporting to be the record of certain acts, prophecies, and visions of one Daniel, who had been carried away as a captive, in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, from Jerusalem to Babylon, and had lived in Babylon until the days of Cyrus and Darius. This "Book of Daniel" found admission into the Jewish

Canon. Its existence and contents were perfectly well known to Christ, who quoted it as prophecy.

If the Book of Daniel was in truth composed and produced not earlier than the year 165 B.C., it is not easy to understand, or even conjecture, how it came to pass that the Jews gave it a place in their Canon of Holy Scripture, while they excluded the work of Jesus Ben-Sira. The question, whether Daniel should be recognized as "*Mikra*" or not must have been decided by the time when Christ warned his disciples (and through them all and sundry) to flee from Jerusalem and Judæa when they should see "the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place." Those to whom Christ was then speaking were Jews. To what purpose would he have quoted, as prophetic, a book which they knew to be excluded from the Canon? It might be answered that the disciples would have accepted, as canonical, anything that their Master might choose to quote as law or prophecy. But we do not find any evidence to show that the Law and the Prophets which he recognized differed from the Law and the Prophets recognized by the Jewish Church.

The canonicity, then, of Daniel may be regarded as having attained the authority of a "*chose jugée*" by the time of our Lord's public ministry. On what grounds, then, was canonical dignity accorded to Daniel, while it was withheld from Ben-Sira? The work of Ben-Sira strongly resembles the Proverbs of Solomon, but this circumstance, so far from being an obstacle, might very possibly have been accounted a positive recommendation for inclusion within the Canon. There is some resemblance between the visions in the latter part of Daniel and those in the Book of Ezekiel, but it is very far from being so close as the resemblance between the maxims of Ben-Sira and those con-

tained in the canonical Book of Proverbs. Daniel, indeed, is hardly like anything else in the Old Testament. In the course of some 250 or 300 years after the supposed date of Daniel (165 B.C.) a number of books, more or less similar, and classified as "apocalyptic" came into existence. None, however, found admission into the Jewish Canon, and only one (the Apocalypse of St. John) found admission into the Canon of the Christian Church. The very novelty of Daniel would, for all one can tell, have been likely to impede, rather than facilitate, the canonization of the book.

There is, then, this serious objection to the date assigned by most modern authorities to the Book of Daniel, viz., that it refuses to fit in with the indubitable fact that Daniel found acceptance as "Holy Writ," sacred and authoritative.

It is true that, in Jewish Bibles, Daniel is placed, not among the Prophets (Nebiim), but among the Hagiographa (Kethubim). But the question may be asked, whether a very great degree of importance was assigned, before the Christian era, to the division into Law, Prophets, and "Writings." St. Luke distributes the Old Testament prophecies concerning Christ among the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke xxiv. 44), but Christ Himself quoted the Old Testament as "the Scriptures," or the Law (John x. 34, xv. 25—both citations from the Psalms), or, as the Law and the Prophets (e.g. Matt. xxii. 40). St. John records how, on one occasion, "the multitude answered, We have heard *out of the Law* that the Christ abideth for ever." The Old Testament passages which they had in mind must have been such as Psalm lxxxix. 4 or Isaiah ix. 7. No text in point can be adduced from the Pentateuch. Furthermore, as we have already noticed, Christ once at least explicitly quoted Daniel as "the prophet."

There is yet another consideration. The division of the

books of the Old Testament into three classes, Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, may be traced back as far as the oldest Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament will take us. The extant MSS. of the Hebrew text are traceable to a single copy. But that copy may not have been made earlier than the Christian era. The "puncta extraordinaria" are, according to Professor Margoliouth, of Roman origin (EXPOSITOR, Sept. and Oct., 1900).¹ We must be careful, then, lest we build too much on the evidence of existing Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament. They may not be absolutely *certain* evidence for the place of Daniel in a MS. of, say, 100 B.C. In such a MS. Daniel *might* have been found next to Ezekiel.

At the same time, certain considerations set forth by Professor Driver in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* and his commentary on the Book of Daniel in the Cambridge Bible² make it impossible to regard the extant Hebrew-Aramaic text as a production of the sixth century B.C. His arguments, as he himself allows, are not all of equal strength. But there seems to be no possibility of "getting round" the fact that in the text of Daniel there are Persian and Greek words. Colonel Conder, indeed, transmutes the Greek words into Assyrian,³ but in a philological question of this sort, it is safer to follow an Oxford Professor than a Colonel of the Royal Engineers.⁴ Sir Robert Anderson tries to ridicule the inference drawn from the presence of the Greek words, but he does not deny that they are Greek, and furnishes no satisfactory explanation of their being found where they are.⁵ Let it be granted, on

¹ See also his *Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation*, pp. 240-241.

² See the Introduction to this Commentary, pp. xlvii.-lxviii.

³ *The First Bible*, p. 38.

⁴ Colonel Conder has the hardihood to assert that ψαλτήριον has no Greek etymology!

⁵ *The Coming Prince* (5th edition); Preface, pp. xxvii.-xxviii.

the evidence of the languages used in the existing text of Daniel, as found in Hebrew Bibles, that the said text dates in its present form from the second century B.C. This admission, however, does not preclude us from seeking a more remote origin for the prophecies contained in the book.

The following is offered as a possible reconstruction of the history of the prophecies and visions ascribed by tradition to Daniel.

An attempt was made by the deputies and agents of Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy utterly the sacred literature of the Jews. "In the hundred and forty and fifth year" (sc. of the Seleucian era, B.C. 168) "they rent in pieces the books of the law which they found, and set them on fire. And wheresoever was found with any a book of the covenant, and if any consented to the law, the King's sentence delivered him to death. Thus did they in their might unto Israel, to those that were found month by month in the cities" (1 Macc. i. 54, 56-58 R.V.). The destruction of "books of the law" would be certain to include other books beside the Mosaic—it would include anything known to be regarded by the Jews as "sacred writings."

The extant text of Daniel is partly Hebrew, partly Aramaic. On the theory that it is all traceable to one author, who lived not earlier than 300, and most probably as late as 165 B.C., it is difficult to account for the Hebrew being dropped in chapter ii. 4, and then resumed in chapter viii. 1. Why not Hebrew *or* Aramaic all through? It is, however, a possible account of the matter that before B.C. 168 there were two Palestinian texts of Daniel, one Hebrew, the other Aramaic, the latter being a version of the former, "in usum plebis," and that portions of the Hebrew text perished irrecoverably in the Bible-hunt of 168 B.C. and the years following, the lacuna being sub-

sequently filled up from the Aramaic version. The disappearance of the rest of the Aramaic may have been due to the establishment of a rule that a Targum might not be committed to writing.¹

The Aramaic version might have been a thing of no great antiquity in 168 B.C. One notices that it is in the Aramaic part of the existing text that the Greek words occur (chap. iii. 5, 7, 10, 15). Naturalized Greek words might easily have been used by a translator in the period 200–170 B.C.² To what epoch, though, is the Hebrew text to be assigned? Professor Driver is assured that the Hebrew of Daniel is Hebrew of the age subsequent to Nehemiah.³ We may contend for the spirit of prophecy enabling a man in the sixth century B.C. to foretell things which were to come to pass in the fourth and the second centuries, but we have no ground, no authority, for contending that the spirit would enable him to speak of those things in the dialect of generations yet unborn. The tests by means of which earlier and later “hands” are said to be discoverable in the composition of the Pentateuch may be fallacious. At any rate, Hebraists of no mean standing have disallowed them, and if such tests are not to be regarded as yielding certain results when applied to the Pentateuch, they may also be doubtful when applied to the Prophets. Still, when such men as Professor Driver and the late Dr. Delitzsch

¹ “Mas’udi in the tenth century describes the Targum not as a book, but as a *language* into which the Jews translate their sacred books” (Margoliouth, *Lines of Defence*, p. 228). Nothing but the Old Testament was written in the period A.D. 70–750; *op. cit.*, p. 232. The determination that the Targum should be left unwritten may have been arrived at several generations earlier.

² The occasion prompting the production of an Aramaic version “in usum plebis” may have been the conquest of Coele-Syria and Palestine by Antiochus the Great, 198–197 B.C. In the wresting of Palestine from the suzerainty of the Lagidæ, the author of the version might well have seen a change that boded ill for his people.

³ *Daniel*, in the Cambridge Bible, Intro. pp. lx.–lxiii.

declare unreservedly that the Hebrew of Daniel is Hebrew of an age later than that of Nehemiah, i.e. later than 430 B.C., their statements must be taken into serious consideration. Accepting, therefore, on their authority, the post-exilian, and rather late post-exilian, date assigned for the Hebrew sections of Daniel, we proceed to ask whether this shuts us up to the fourth century B.C. as the very earliest epoch within which the prophecies of the book can be believed to have originated. Not of necessity. The state of the matter seems to be this. In the fourth century B.C. a record of such visions, prophecies, and acts of Daniel as were known to tradition was made, in the Hebrew of the time. This document contained a great deal of matter which did not really rest upon the authority of the sixth-century prophet himself. The scribe who produced it had no access to good sources of Babylonian and Persian history, and therefore fell into those inaccuracies (e.g. making Darius come before Cyrus in the Persian succession) which are considered signs of the comparatively late origin of the book of Daniel.¹ The historical narrative (chaps. i.-vi.) may be regarded as the work of this scribe, its actual basis being a perhaps rather scant tradition concerning oracles delivered by Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, and attempts made to induce him and other Jews to abandon the worship of Jehovah for paganism. In the apocalyptic section (chaps. vii.-xii.) it is at the least allowable to suppose that the compiler found much less scope for amplification.

But by what manner of tradition were acts, prophecies, and visions of Daniel in the sixth century B.C. preserved in remembrance for, it may have been, full two hundred years ?

Is it a thing incredible that the tradition was an oral one ? The Oriental memory is equal to much greater feats than

¹ *Daniel*, in the Cambridge Bible, Introd. pp. xlviii.-liv.

this, of preserving virtually (at any rate) intact for two hundred years the words in which a man had prophesied before kings or had described visions in which the course of history, in ages yet to come, the rise and fall of great empires, had been disclosed to him.

For some 700 years the Jews allowed themselves to write nothing but the canonical Scriptures. So we are told by the Talmud, and on this point Professor Margoliouth, a competent witness, declares that the Talmud cannot be mistaken.¹ During those 700 years oral tradition carried a vast and ever-increasing burden—not only the manner of pronouncing and intoning the holy writings, but the meaning of the language in which they were written, and a mass of comments and interpretations—all the heterogeneous contents of the Mishna. In view of this, the preservation of what must have amounted to little more than half of what now constitutes the Hebrew-Aramaic text of Daniel seems a very small exploit.

To describe with exactness and in detail the original form of Daniel's oracles and visions is now no longer within our power. But that in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Cyrus and Darius, there lived, at the courts of Babylon and Susa, a Jew who served these monarchs in positions of trust, who testified to them of the Divine will, who had visions of a future from himself very remote, need not, and indeed ought not, to be doubted. One needs something more substantial than the hero of a Midrash for the source of prophecies to which Christ appealed for testimony concerning Himself.

But it may be asked, "How do you account for Ezekiel quoting Daniel as an example of righteousness, on a par with Noah and Job, if Daniel was a younger contemporary of Ezekiel?" The Bible, it may be answered, contains

¹ *Lines of Defence*, p. 232.

more than one instance of the younger being preferred before the elder. No doubt, Ezekiel must have had a very strong reason for mentioning Daniel on an equality with Job and Noah. So indeed he had. "*The word of the Lord came to me*, saying, Son of man, when a land sinneth against me, and I stretch out mine hand upon it . . . though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness" (Ezek. xiv. 13-14; cf. 16, 18 and 20). It was not so much Ezekiel as the Lord from whom the word came to the prophet, who testified to the righteousness of Daniel.

Then how are we to account for the absence of Daniel's name from Ben-Sira's catalogue of famous men? It is, indeed, a question whether Daniel's name was absent from that catalogue in its original form. Ezra's name, it may be pointed out, is like Daniel's, conspicuous by absence. Furthermore, the reading of the Vatican Codex in the second half of Ecclus. xlix. 10 suggests that a name in the singular number has disappeared, and the reading of the same MS. in xlix. 15 does *not* favour the rendering "Neither was there a man born like Joseph." Though indeed, even if the Vatican Codex supported that rendering, it would be no great matter. Ben-Sira has already made an over-statement with regard to Enoch (*v.* 14) whose translation was not a greater miracle than the ascension of Elijah, and he might easily have made another one with regard to Joseph. Yet again, Ben-Sira mentions Ezekiel, and Ezekiel mentions Daniel. The Greek text in xlix. 9 is of doubtful accuracy. Professor Margoliouth thinks that the real meaning of the original Hebrew was "he made mention of Job in an allusion and blessed those who direct their ways aright."¹ The mention of Job as referred to by Ezekiel would mean at the very least that Ben-Sira was not ignorant of Daniel's

¹ *Lines of Defence*, pp. 177-182.

name and fame as a righteous man. At the same time it is possible that Daniel's name never figured in Ben-Sira's catalogue, and was intentionally left out, in deference to the opinion of those who, in his day, were yet doubtful whether Daniel should be accounted "holy writ" or not.

If there was a controversy in Israel, about B.C. 200, over the question of Daniel's claim to a place among the canonical Scriptures, it was set at rest, once for all, by the events of 168 B.C. and the years following. But if the hypothesis offered above is true, viz., that the *text* of Daniel is not of sixth-century origin, but fourth-century at the earliest, the knowledge of this may have led to placing this book with the Psalter and the Megilloth rather than with the Prophets.

H. T. F. DUCKWORTH.

THE ALPHABETIC STRUCTURE OF PSALMS IX. AND X.

SOME few years since ¹ I attempted to prove afresh (for at the time it was not generally admitted by English scholars) the existence in the first chapter of Nahum of part of an alphabetic poem; in recoil from certain over-elaborate and inconclusive attempts to prove that an *entire* alphabetic poem lay concealed there, several writers had expressed scepticism of the existence of even a part of such a poem, for which nevertheless the evidence, rightly considered, was really, and is now more generally admitted to be, irresistible.

I here propose to re-discuss the question of the alphabetic structure of Psalms ix. and x. In this case it is agreed that we have to do with parts of an alphabetic poem (or of two); but opinion remains divided as to the extent of these parts. In the interests alike of the criticism of the Psalter, the

¹ THE EXPOSITOR, 1898 (Sept.), pp. 207-220.

history of the Hebrew text and the interpretation of the particular Psalm (or Psalms), it is important to narrow down the legitimate differences of opinion to the utmost.

In the present Hebrew text, and consequently in modern versions, Psalms ix. and x. form two distinct poems. On the other hand, in the Septuagint, probably also in the later Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, certainly also in Jerome's version, which was made direct from the Hebrew, Psalms ix. and x. formed a single undivided whole.¹ Is the unity of the poem as presented in the versions accidental or fictitious? or does the division into two Psalms in the Hebrew text correspond to original diversity of origin? These questions, which are of first importance for the interpretation of the poem (or poems), are intimately connected with the question of the alphabetic structure.

The unity of the two Psalms has been maintained chiefly by those who also hold that the incompleteness of the alphabetic scheme, which marks the text in its present condition, is mainly due to textual corruption. This theory has been presented (with many differences in detail) by Bickell, by Dr. T. K. Abbot, whose valuable article,² dependent in the main on Bickell, but with important independent suggestions, seems to have exercised less influence than it deserved, by Dr. Cheyne in the second edition of his *Book of Psalms*, and by Duhm. It is, I believe, substantially correct, and its failure to gain more general support from English writers is probably due to the numerous and, in some cases, necessarily uncertain conjectures with which its presentation has been connected. My more particular purpose is to show that the alphabetic arrangement certainly extends *further*

¹ See Baethgen, *Psalmen*³, p. 22.

² In *Hermathena*, 1889, pp. 21-28; also in *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments*, pp. 200-207.

than has been generally admitted except by those who have argued that it extended throughout. If this can be established, it will invalidate the most attractive of the theories that deny the unity of the poem, that of Baethgen, which I shall describe below, and it will establish at the least a considerable presumption that the alphabetic arrangement, where it now fails to appear or appears less clearly, once existed, and consequently that the two Psalms are a unity whose integrity has been impaired mainly, if not exclusively, by the ordinary accidents of textual transmission.

To facilitate the discussion I give first a translation with some notes on the text, chiefly on those parts of the text which are of importance in the present examination. In order to concentrate attention on my main point, I have left unadopted, and generally, too, unnoticed, many emendations suggested more especially by Dr. Cheyne and Duhamel which otherwise would unquestionably deserve attention, if not acceptance. But the result of my examination, as I point out at the close, appears to me to render certain types of these emendations improbable.

In the translation all departures from the Hebrew consonantal text, whether justified by the ancient versions or not, are printed in italics. Words which are unintelligible (either in themselves or in their context), and yet cannot be satisfactorily emended, are left untranslated and represented by . . . ; in some cases where a lacuna may be suspected I have used the signs + + +. Words or letters omitted are represented by ^ . So far as the alphabetic strophes are clear, I have printed them as strophes with the initial letter at the head, following the method adopted in the Authorized Version and Revised Version of Psalm cxix. and by Dr. G. A. Smith in his translation of Lamentations ii. and iv. in the EXPOSITOR for April, 1906, pp. 327-336. The initial letters, which do not occur in the present Hebrew

text, I have given in brackets alongside of the immediately preceding initial, at the head of a section extending (without subdivision into strophes) down to the next initial occurring in the text. In this way I hope that I may bring the problem presented by the present state of the text somewhat clearly before the reader's eye. In Psalm ix. the verses are numbered according to the Hebrew enumeration, which, beginning with 2, is one in advance of the English throughout. In Psalm x. the Hebrew and English enumerations agree.

א

- IX. ² I will give thanks unto *Thee*, Yahweh, with my whole heart
 I will recount all Thy wonders ;
³ I will rejoice and exult in Thee,
 I will make melody to Thy Name, O Most High.

ב

- ⁴ Because mine enemies shall turn backward,
 Shall stumble and perish at Thy presence ;
⁵ For Thou hast maintained my right and my cause,
 Hast sat upon the throne as a righteous judge.

ג, (ד), (ה)

- ⁶ Thou hast rebuked the nations + + +,
 Thou hast destroyed the wicked + + + ;
 Thou hast wiped out their name for ever and aye,
⁷ The enemy (?) + + +.
Silent (?) are the ruins for ever,
 And the cities Thou didst uproot—perished is their memory.
Behold (?) ⁸ Yahweh sitteth (enthroned) for ever,

^{2a} *Thee* with LXX. (i.e. אֲדָרָה for אֲדָרָה of the Hebrew text), and in agreement with the address to Yahweh in the following verses.

^{6ab} Duhm, perhaps rightly, sees here fragments of two parallel lines (for the thought is certainly parallel) rather than the whole of a single line (R.V. and most).

^{7 8} These verses are certainly corrupt, but the above emendations (like others that have been proposed) are little more than makeshifts.

Silent : reading תָּמוּ רָמוּ. The Authorized Version (— R.V. marg.) is sufficiently criticized by Kirkpatrick, but the Revised Version is also very questionable ; literally the Hebrew text runs, *The enemy* (singular) *are* (plural) *ruins for ever*.

Behold : reading הִנֵּה יְהוָה for הִמָּה וְיְהוָה of the Hebrew text. The Revised Version again substitutes for a wrong translation of the Author-

- He hath established His throne for judgment ;
 * And 'tis He will judge the world in righteousness,
 He will pass sentence on the peoples in equity.

י

- ¹⁰ So may Yahweh be a high retreat for the crushed,
 A high retreat in seasons of extremity ;
¹¹ And let them that know Thy Name trust in Thee,
 For Thou hast not forsaken them that seek Thee, O Yahweh.

י

- ¹² Make melody unto Yahweh, who sitteth (enthroned) in Zion,
 Declare among the peoples His doings ;
¹³ For he that requireth blood hath remembered ^ ,
 He hath not forgotten the cry of the afflicted.

י

- ¹⁴ Be gracious to me, Yahweh, behold my affliction ^ ,
 O Thou who raisest me up from the gates of Death ;
¹⁵ In order that I may recount all Thy praises,
 (And) in the gates of Zion's daughter exult in Thy salvation.

ט

- ¹⁶ The nations have sunk down in the pit they made,
 In the net they hid their own foot has been caught ;
¹⁷ Yahweh hath made Himself known in the execution of justice,
 The wicked has been trapped in the work of his own hands.

י

- ¹⁸ The wicked shall return unto Sheol,
 (Even) all the nations that forget God ;

כ

- ¹⁹ For the poor shall not be forgotten for ever,
 (Nor) the hope of the afflicted perish for aye.

ized Version a wrong one of its own. In rendering *their very memorial has perished*, it emphasizes *memorial* which the Hebrew text does not, and omits the emphasis which (doubtless owing to textual corruption) actually falls on the pronoun. The only correct rendering of the present text is *their memorial, even theirs, has perished*.

^{13a} *Remembered* : Hebrew text adds *them* ; but the position of the pronoun is suspicious.

^{14a} *Affliction* : Hebrew text adds מִשְׁנֵאִי which Revised Version renders (*which I suffer*) of *them that hate me*. But the construction is harsh, and the presence of the word overloads the line. Not improbably מִשְׁנֵאִי has arisen from מִנְשֵׂאִי, the participle originally used in the next line, which was subsequently explained by the synonymous מְרוֹמָמִי (so Lagarde, and many since).

- ²⁰ Arise, Yahweh, let not frail man be strong,
 Let the nations be judged before Thy face ;
²¹ Appoint terror for them, O Yahweh,
 Let the nations know they are frail men.

(מ) ל

- X. ¹ Wherefore, Yahweh, standest Thou afar off,
 Hidest Thou (Thine eyes) in seasons of extremity ?
² In arrogance the wicked hotly pursues the afflicted ;
 Let them be caught in the devices they have imagined.
³ For the wicked praiseth *his* desire ;
 The greedy getter blesseth *his* appetite.

(ס) נ

- ⁴ The wicked ³ contemneth Yahweh (saying)—
⁴ “ According to His full anger He will not punish ” ;
 “ There is no God ” is the sum of his thoughts ;
⁵ Stable are his ways at all times.

³ The last two words of the Hebrew text of this verse belong to verse 4 : see next note. After their removal, there remains—

בִּיהַלֵּל רִשַׁע עַל תַּאוֹת נַפְשׁוֹ
 וּבִצַּע בָּרֶךְ

These lines are obviously ill-balanced ; הַלֵּל רִשַׁע in the first is parallel to בִּצַּע בָּרֶךְ in the second, but the object in the first line consists of two words parallel in sense, while the second contains no object at all. Apparently, then, the missing object of the second line has accidentally shifted up to the line above. If so, תַּאוֹת once immediately preceded וּבִצַּע ; by a wrong division of words the ו appears to have become detached from an original תַּאוֹתוֹ and prefixed to וּבִצַּע. In line one the עַל is probably derived from an original ל by reading the final ע of the preceding word twice. The two lines now balance and parallel one another perfectly. For the phrase to *bless one's own soul* or *appetite*, used of the godless, cf. xlix. 19. This is Duhm's emendation, and, to quote his words, the thought is “ The godless man praises not God, but his own belly (cf. Luke xii. 19) ” : cf. also Phil. iii. 19. The lines, thus restored, run as follows:—

בִּיהַלֵּל רִשַׁע לַתַּאוֹתוֹ
 וּבִצַּע בָּרֶךְ נַפְשׁוֹ

⁴ In the Hebrew text the last line of v. 3 and the first of v. 4 stand thus:—

וּבִצַּע בָּרֶךְ נַאֲן יְהוָה
 רִשַׁע כְּנַבָּה אִפּוֹ בִּלְיִדְרִשׁ

But the citation from this verse in v. 13 (עַל מַה נַּאֲן רִשַׁע אֱלֹהִים), *Wherefore* “ *hath the wicked contemned God* ”) clearly shows that נַאֲן יְהוָה רִשַׁע originally stood here as an independent sentence ; and so it does stand in the earliest form of the text, to wit, in the LXX. Consequently, what precedes נַאֲן belongs to v. 3 ; what follows רִשַׁע begins a new line and a new sentence. These positive reasons for the division of sentences

In the height (?) are Thy judgments from before him ;
 As for all his adversaries, he puffeth at them ;
 6 He saith in his heart, " I shall never be shaken,"

. 7

adopted above are supported by strong negative considerations, viz. that the last line of *v.* 3 as it stands in the Hebrew text and R.V. admits of no satisfactory and natural explanation, and that those who follow the Hebrew sentence-division are driven to a highly questionable translation of the words *כְּנֹבָה אָפוֹ*—*the pride of his countenance* (R.V.), or *the loftiness of his looks* ; but *countenance* in Hebrew is *פָּנִים*, not *אָף*. *אָף* means *nostril*, *nose*, and then, metaphorically, *anger* ; that in Hebrew (or Arabic) it ever acquired the sense *face* is, to say the least, unproven. It is customary (and idiomatically correct) to render *אִפִּים אֶרֶצָה*—*with the face to the earth* ; but there is no reason to question that the Hebrew thought of the *nose*, rather than the whole face, touching the ground.

^{5b} *In the height* : questionable, but, if correct, to be paraphrased as in R.V. Abbot happily suggests *סָרוּ* for *בָּרוּם*, and renders, *Removed are Thy judgments from before him*.

⁶ This verse originally included the first word of *v.* 7 (see next note). The smooth translation of the R.V., with its excellent parallels, completely conceals the really desperate character of the Hebrew text. Presumably the Revisers treated *אֲשֶׁר* as — *ἔτι* recitative, and therefore left it untranslated. This is a rare usage, but sufficiently established to justify invoking it, if *אֲשֶׁר* really introduced the speech here ; but it does not : it stands nearly at the end of the words spoken (after *all generations*) ! The A.V. (*He hath said in his heart, I shall not be moved : for (I shall) never (be in adversity)*) is, perhaps, a less illegitimate translation, but the sense is self-condemnatory—I shall not be moved, because I shall not be moved. Tautologous, too, is Dr. Driver's translation (*Parallel Psalter*), " I shall not be moved, I who to all generations shall not be in adversity." Other attempts have been made to render and explain the verse as it stands, but these may suffice to show that the present text is really impossible. We might, indeed, render—*He hath said in his heart, I shall never be moved who is not in adversity*, i.e. He who is now prosperous is confident that his prosperity will continue, but for three considerations : (1) The two lines would be exceedingly ill-balanced ; (2) the *order* would be as awkward in Hebrew as I have intentionally made it in English ; and (3) it takes no account of *אֵלֶּה* which has to be included from *v.* 7.

Duhm's treatment of the words *אֲשֶׁר לֹא בָרַע*, together with *אֵלֶּה* of *v.* 7, may be in the right direction, but it is not free from some of the objections urged against the present text. He points *אֵלֶּה* of *v.* 7 *אֵלֶּה* (= *אֵלֹוֹ* Gesenius-Kautzsch's *Grammar*, 91 e), the word found in a similar context in lxxiii. 4 (wrongly rendered in R.V.), and renders, *He whose paunch is not ill (fed)*, i.e. the godless " in fair round belly with good capon lined " forgets God, and is quite happy about his own fate.

⁷ Again the R.V. conceals the strange order of the Hebrew text as at present divided. To visualize the argument for the division adopted

פ

His mouth is full of deceits and oppression,
 Under his tongue is mischief and trouble;
⁸ He sitteth in places of ambush in the villages,
 In secret places he slayeth the innocent.

ץ (צ)

His eyes watch privily for the hapless,
⁹ He lieth in ambush in a secret place as a lion in his covert,
 He lieth in ambush to snatch away the afflicted,
 He snatcheth away the afflicted, dragging him off in his net.
¹⁰ [The righteous] . . . sinketh down,
 And the hapless fall by his strong ones (?).

above, I give the R.V. altered only in so far as to restore the Hebrew order:—

Cursing | his mouth is full of | and | deceit and oppression,
 Under his tongue is | mischief and iniquity.
 A mere glance at the lines suggests the strong probability that the words *cursing* and *and* in the first line are intrusive, and have spoilt a very fine and perfect parallelism. But, further: (1) The position of אלה, *cursing*, before the verb throws on it a strong emphasis, for which, nevertheless, no reason can be discovered, and the real object consisting, like its parallel in the next line of a *pair* of qualities, comes limping awkwardly in at the end as an afterthought. Why is there a stress on cursing? Why so much more stress on cursing than on deceit or oppression? Why, perhaps we may further ask, is cursing somewhat incongruously coupled with “deceit and oppression”? These are questions which commentators who follow the traditional division of the text have never answered, if they have even considered them. (2) The inclusion of אלה in the first line would overload it, giving it five word-accent against the four of its parallel: this lack of balance is only aggravated when Baethgen removes אשׁר from v. 6 and prefixes it to v. 7!

Read, then, in 7a פיהו מלא מרמות ותך, i.e. omit the ך before מרמות (necessarily introduced when אלה had been connected with v. 7), or less probably the waw of ומרמות may have shifted from an original מולא, lit. *Deceit and oppression fill his mouth*.

⁹ *In a secret place*: The omission of these words, which may have been accidentally repeated from 8b, would improve the vigour and rhythm of the line.

¹⁰ Again, the attempt to render the existing Hebrew text has reduced commentators to the most desperate straits. R.V. renders,

He croucheth, he boweth down,

And the helpless fall by his strong ones.

But to whom does the pronoun refer? Many, since Ewald, have referred it to the lion, and have quite gratuitously explained “his strong ones” to mean his claws. But this involves the extremely improbable sup-

- ¹¹ He saith in his heart, "God has forgotten,
He hath hidden His face (and) seeth nevermore."

ק

- ¹² Arise, Yahweh, O God, lift up Thine hand :
Forget not *the cry of* the afflicted ;
¹³ Wherefore hath the wicked contemned Yahweh ?
Hath he said in his heart, "Thou wilt not punish" ?

ר

- ¹⁴ Thou hast seen $\wedge \wedge$ mischief and vexation,
Thou lookest (upon them) to place them in Thy hand ;
The hapless committeth his cause unto Thee,
Thou hast been the helper of the orphan.

ש

- ¹⁵ Break the arm of the wicked, and evil,

position that the pronoun refers to a subject introduced *allusively* three lines before (9a) and *dismissed*, for 9b, c cannot refer to the lion, since the lion does not hunt with a net, nor insist that his meal shall consist in particular of the poor. As the text stands, the subject of 9b, c, that is, the wicked man, can alone be reasonably regarded as the subject of 10a. But, then, why should the wicked man be described as *crushed* ? for this, and not *to crouch* (R.V.) is the sense of רכה. As a matter of fact, 10a must be interpreted by its parallel 10b ; both lines must refer to the poor : but, then, a term referring to the poor is as badly needed in 10a as in 10b—indeed, more so. Thus exegetical considerations point strongly to the loss in 10a of a term parallel to הלכאים in 10b. Rhythmical considerations point strongly in the same direction. For (1) 10a (two words) is shorter than its parallel (three words) ; and (2) it is abnormally short in relation to the entire poem : it is the only real and unambiguous case (even in the present text) of a line of two words. The obscure רכה (or ירכה k'rê) I have left untranslated above, but to bring out the sense I have tentatively made good the loss of the term parallel to *hapless* in 10b. Whether that term was *righteous* or one of a dozen others must be determined, if determined it can be, by other arguments than those here adduced to prove that *some* word, be it what it may, has fallen out of the text at this point.

^{12 a b.} The lines are ill-balanced ; perhaps אל (O God) in a is an editor's substitute for Yahweh : in line b צעקה has been supplied in accordance with ix. 13.

^{14 a.} The Hebrew text is scarcely tolerable. Duhm (followed above) omits כי אתה as a corrupt duplication of ראתה. Even so perhaps the original text is not exactly recovered.

^{15 a.} The LXX., which connects *the wicked and the evil*, is preferable to the Massoretic interpretation of the Hebrew text, which begins a fresh sentence with the second term (so R.V.).

- Though \wedge wickedness be sought for, it shall not be found ;
¹⁶ Yahweh is King for ever and aye,
 The nations are perished out of His land.

נ

- ¹⁷ Thou, Yahweh, hast heard the desire of the humble,
 Thou directest their heart, makest Thine ear attentive ;
¹⁸ To do justice to the orphan and the crushed,
 That frail man of the earth may terrorize no more.

The two laws of an alphabetic poem are (1) that the initials of successive strophes follow the order of the alphabet, and (2) that these initials should follow one another at regular intervals. This regular interval in Psalms ix. and x. is four lines, as may be seen by a glance at the strophes beginning with א, ב, ג, ד, ה, ו, ז, ח, ט, י, ק, ל, not at present to refer to others.

The lines throughout the poem are of equal or approximately equal length, the normal length being three or four accented words. Of the eighty-three lines into which the Revised Version divides the two Psalms, fifteen are abnormally long or short, i.e. they contain more than four or less than three accented words. Of these eight in the Hebrew text contain only two accented words, six contain five, and one contains seven. But the line of seven words (x. 14a) should certainly be read as two lines (and probably of three words each, one word being dittographic) as in the above translation, x. 14a, b. On the other hand, the Revised Version wrongly makes two lines (each of two accents) out of one in the case of ix. 14b, c = ix. 15b in the above translation. In this case the mis-division of the Revised Version spoils the parallelism. The case is similar, though less

^{15b}. The meaning is clear—Exterminate wickedness : but how precisely this was expressed is uncertain. I have read רשעו for רשע, and both verbs as Niphals.

^{18b} The line is over long. Duhm omits the last three words, and renders *hat they may be in dread no more*.

obvious, with ix. 13*a*, *b'* (R.V.) = ix. 14*a* above (one line of four accents ; see note above). With this corrected division of lines the Π strophe, like the nine strophes enumerated above, contains four lines, each of normal length, instead of four abnormally short lines and two normal lines, giving in all, in the Revised Version, six lines to the strophe which would be altogether abnormal.

We have still to consider five lines each containing in the Massoretic text two word accents, and six lines each containing five. Of the five lines of two accents, four become of the normal length of three accents, if we simply delete the makkeph : these are ix. 2*b*, 4*a*, 14*b*, x. 12*b* ; in the last case, however, the shortness is more probably caused by the loss of a word (see note above). The only remaining instance of a line of two accents is x. 10*a*, and in that line, as I have shown above, there are very strong exegetical reasons for suspecting the loss of a word.

Two of the lines of five accents contain a word which there are strong reasons (already given), apart from rhythmic considerations, for transposing in the one case (ix. 7*b*) to the following, and in the other (x. 7*a*) to the preceding line. With the removal of the intrusive words these lines become of the normal length of four words. If in x. 6*a* *לדר ודר* be makkephed, as in Psalm cxxxv. 13, and in ix. 19*a* *לא לנצה*, as in Psalm ciii. 9, these lines also are of normal length. There remain x. 12*a* and x. 18*b*, where reasons, other than rhythmical, for reducing the length of the lines are less cogent.

This survey may suffice to show that the text of lines containing less than three or more than four accents is open to grave suspicion.

The most crucial question in dealing with the structure of Psalms ix. and x. is this—How far back from the end of the Psalm does the alphabetic arrangement extend ? It

is generally said that the strophes beginning with the last four letters (ת, ש, ר, ק) remain ; but it is also commonly stated or *implied* that the immediately preceding strophes have been lost and their place taken by others, or that these strophes, though as they stand they are original, were never brought into the alphabetic scheme. But what are the facts ? I turn first to the twelve lines immediately preceding the ק strophe, for here are facts which have been overlooked or not appreciated.

1. The eighth line (x. 8c) before the ק strophe begins with ש, i.e. ש occurs as an initial letter *at the exact interval* from ק at which it should occur in an alphabetic poem following the order observed in Lamentations ii., iii., iv.¹ where the פ strophe precedes the ש (see EXPOSITOR, April, 1906, pp. 327-36).

Even if this fact stood by itself and so might possibly be due to accident, it ought to be taken account of ; but it does not stand alone, for

2. If we read back three lines and four words (i.e. the normal length of a line), in all therefore four lines, from the point where the initial ש occurs, we find the word פִּירוּ : i.e. פ stands *at the exact interval* from ק and ש at which it should stand by the well established laws of this poem. I have stated the fact thus, for thus stated it is indisputable. It is true that according to the traditional verse division פִּירוּ does not stand at the beginning of the line, but I have shown in the note on the passage above that there are the strongest reasons (entirely independent of alphabetic considerations) for holding that the line originally began with this word, and that the traditional division of the text gives bad sense, bad rhythm and bad parallelism.

¹ The same order (ש before פ) was found by the Greek translators in their Hebrew text of Prov. xxxi. It was probably also found in the original form of Ps. xxxiv., for sense seems to require the transposition of vv. 16 and 17 (- 15, 16 R.V.).

3. Although the fourth line (x. 10a) before the initial ρ does not begin with \mathfrak{A} , there are, as I have already shown, the strongest independent reasons for believing that this abnormally short line has lost a word in the course of textual transmission.

I submit that this combination of facts—the abnormal shortness and strangeness of the fourth line before initial ρ , the occurrence of initial \mathfrak{V} at the beginning of the eighth and of initial \mathfrak{D} at the beginning of the twelfth line—is not accidental, but is due to the fact that Psalm x. concludes not merely with the last four but with the last seven strophes of an alphabetic poem.

Working back afresh from the initial ρ in x. 12 we find at the beginning of the twentieth line before it the letter \mathfrak{J} (in x. 3b),¹ i.e. \mathfrak{J} stands *at the exact interval* before ρ at which it should stand in an alphabetic poem of four-lined strophes. On the other hand, if we count downwards from the initial ' in ix. 18, or the \mathfrak{J} in x. 1, it occurs two lines too soon. Moreover the initial \mathfrak{D} , which should precede it, and the \mathfrak{D} , which should follow, are not found in the present text. Having regard to these facts alone, we might consider the position of \mathfrak{J} in relation to ρ accidental. But when we connect this with our previous conclusion, such an explanation becomes difficult; for \mathfrak{J} occurs at the correct interval before not only ρ but also before \mathfrak{D} and \mathfrak{V} . I recall further at this point that the fifth line after the \mathfrak{J} (x. 5b), where initial \mathfrak{D} should stand, is suspicious, though perhaps not impossible, in style, and that the substitution of a similar word beginning with \mathfrak{D} appears to be a considerable improvement. The case of the missing initial \mathfrak{D} may be taken with a consideration of the first part of the poem; and this may be brief, for opinion differs less seriously here.

¹ For the justification of following the Greek as against the Hebrew tradition in beginning the line with \mathfrak{A} , see note above.

Of late it has never been seriously questioned that Psalm ix. was originally alphabetic, and this being so it is unnecessary to discuss at length whether the 7 and 7 strophes were shorter than the rest in the original poem. No reason or sound analogy can be given for such abbreviation, and we have not the slightest ground for assuming that the author was such a bungler as without reason to have failed in the very simple art of writing an alphabetic poem. It follows that the equivalent of about four lines has fallen out of the text between ix. 6 and ix. 10.

But if this has certainly happened at one point in the poem, it is not improbable that it has happened elsewhere. If, therefore, the alphabetic structure can be traced down to the 5 strophe and from the 2 strophe to the end, the most probable explanation of the facts that in the present text six lines only instead of eight stand between initial 5 and initial 2 and that initial 2 is absent must surely be that two lines have fallen out of the text, one of which contained the missing initial.

The only strophes now left for consideration are those with the initials ' and 2. The ' strophe clearly begins with ix. 18, for the initial ' occurs here and at the correct interval after 2; but where did it end? The data appear to me somewhat ambiguous. But the question is obviously connected with another: does the original 2 occur in the present text; if so, where? One suggestion may be decisively dismissed, for it too implicitly charges the author with bungling. It has been said that the p with which ix. 20 begins was intentionally substituted for 2 because the two letters had some resemblance in sound! This is as if the composer of an English acrostic should find it beyond his powers to discover a suitable word beginning with C and should use instead a word beginning with G!

If the original 2 survives, it most probably survives in

the first word of ix. 19; then the present text would present a ' strophe of two followed by a 𐤓 strophe of six lines. In that case we must suppose that a couplet has shifted from the ' into the 𐤓 strophe, and we may, with Duham, place ix. 21 immediately after ix. 18. But this, though a possible, and indeed a not improbable solution, is not certain, for though ix. 21 follows ix. 18 well enough, its connexion with ix. 18 is by no means obviously better than with ix. 20.

Others have suggested that ix. 20, 21 do not belong to the original alphabetic poem but are an independent close to Psalm ix. This theory would be more probable if the verses were absent from the Greek text; but they are not, and the theory requires the assumption that verses intended to form an independent close to Psalm ix. after it had been separated from Psalm x. are present in a text which still treats Psalms ix. and x. as continuous.

One curious fact must not be concealed. Psalm ix. 20 begins with 𐤐 and the third line following (ix. 21a) with 𐤔. In this sequence Baethgen detects the continuation, after a gap of several strophes, of ix. 19. He also assumes the loss of two lines after ix. 20. This particular assumption is invalidated, if it be shown that the original 𐤐 strophe really occurs in Psalm x. It is just possible, however, that, if ix. 20, 21 are intrusive, they were derived from an alphabetic poem of two-lined strophes; but the sequence may quite well be accidental; to be sure of alphabetic structure we need a sequence of at least three letters, for only so can we determine the fixed interval between the letters which gives the sequence its significance.

I conclude my discussion with a brief criticism of certain theories as to the literary and textual history of Psalms ix. and x.

Professor Kirkpatrick's ultimate conclusion is that Psalm ix. "appears to be complete in itself, and it seems preferable

to regard Psalm x. as a companion piece rather than as part of a continuous whole." This appears to me highly improbable, and it certainly does nothing to alleviate the grave exegetical difficulties which Baethgen attempts to remove ; but I will not discuss it here, for it does not depend on any conclusion as to the completeness of the alphabetic structure, since it would not be safe to deny that a writer may have chosen to compose two separate poems, one following the alphabetic scheme to the eleventh letter, the other from the twelfth to the twenty-second and last.

Some other theories which deny the unity of Psalms ix. and x. have proceeded from the assumption that parts of the two Psalms are alphabetic, and parts non-alphabetic ; and that x. 1-11 or x. 3-11 are the non-alphabetic part, which is of different origin from the rest. Now such theories must be so modified as to be scarcely worth maintaining if my argument that even in the present text the alphabetic structure can be clearly traced back to x. 7 is sound ; and they fall completely to the ground if my further argument that the original initial **י** survives in its original position in x. 3 is also admitted.

Baethgen's theory may be considered at greater length, for it is based on weighty exegetical considerations. I will cite his remarks somewhat fully. After indicating the reasons for considering that Psalms ix. and x. were originally connected, he continues : " The reason for the division adopted by the Massoretes lies in the difference of subject ; but the conclusion of Psalm x. refers to the same circumstances that form the subject of Psalm ix. ; moreover the alphabetic scheme does not reach its close till the end of Psalm x. Psalm ix. is a song of thanksgiving and triumph over the defeat of heathen foes. . . . With x. 1 ff. there begin bitter complaints about the absence (*Ausbleiben*) of divine help. But the oppressors are not the same as in Psalm ix. ;

they are not heathen, but godless Israelites. . . . Corresponding to this remarkable change from triumph to bitter complaint and to the entirely different historic background which is presupposed is a break in the alphabetic arrangement." Baethgen then points out, as I have already done, how the alphabetic scheme survives down to the ' strophe in ix. 19 and then continues, "After this everything is lost till ק ix. 20, ש ix. 21. In x. 1-11 there is no alphabetic arrangement. In x. 12, 13 again ק, in x. 14 ר, in x. 15 f. ש, and x. 17, 18 ת. Since x. 16-18 agree most excellently with the beginning, and indeed with the entire contents of Psalm ix., but not in the slightest with the rest of Psalm x., the conjecture that x. 1-15 formed no original part of the poem cannot be dismissed. The verses x. 12-15 follow, it is true, an alphabetic arrangement, but their subject matter and language connect them with x. 1-11; cf. x. 13 with x. 3, 4, 11, x. 14 with x. 8-10 (חלכה), x. 15 with x. 4. The language of x. 1-15 is harder and more peculiar than that of ix. 1-21, x. 16-18; yet between both parts there are links, cf. x. 1 and ix. 10 (לעתות בצרה): x. 12 with ix. 13, 19. It is no longer possible to explain satisfactorily all these remarkable phenomena. The interpolation of x. 1-15 and the loss of the strophes from כ to צ between ix. 19 and ix. 20 may have been accidental and perhaps due to a leaf getting misplaced in binding. . . . But it is just as likely that a later editor intentionally gave the Psalm its present form by removing a section and substituting another for it."

Certainly Baethgen's strongest argument is drawn from the apparent difference of subject in the present text—in ix. and x. 16-19 the nations, in x. 1-15 the wicked. Both Dr. Cheyne and Duhm, who maintain the substantial unity of the whole feel this so strongly that they assimilate ix. and x. 16-18 to x. 1-15 by reading where the term *nations* (גוים) occurs either *the treacherous* (בגדים; so Cheyne), or *the proud* (גאים; so Duhm).

Baethgen's argument from difference of style I believe to be fallacious; the style of x. 1-15 only appears harder when we treat what has suffered corruption and become unintelligible as the original style of the writer. Doubtless parts of x. 1-15, particularly x. 6-10, are in the present text harder than most of Psalm ix.; but they are corrupt; and in turn ix. 6, 7, which are also corrupt, are harder than, for example, x. 1, 2 or x. 7 (after אלה) to x. 9.

But the theory breaks down owing to the improbabilities which it implies in connexion with the alphabetic sequence. It will be sufficient to consider what Baethgen, in common with every one else, admits, that x. 12-18 constitute a perfect sequence of four alphabetic strophes (ת, ש, ר, ק). Yet on Baethgen's theory this perfect sequence is the result of accident. The last strophe and a half belonged to one poem, the remaining two and a half to another; in binding, a leaf fell out of place and with it the original alphabetic order was broken, and yet, marvellous to relate, the leaf which accidentally took its place contained part of another alphabetic poem of precisely the same structure which exactly dovetailed into the end of the poem. The last lines of the lost leaf should have contained the four lines of a ק strophe, followed by four lines of a ר strophe, followed by two lines of a ש strophe: the leaf which on the hypothesis was accidentally substituted for it actually contained four lines of a ק strophe, followed by four lines of a ר strophe, followed by two lines of a ש strophe. Moreover the accidentally substituted leaf so well dovetails into the leaf that preceded that it commences with ל at the exact and correct interval of eight lines from the initial י.

The case is scarcely better if we accept Baethgen's alternative suggestion that x. 1-15 were *intentionally* substituted for a section of the original alphabetic poem. For are we to suppose that the editor selected these verses in particular

because he noticed that they contained the suitable sequence ψ, γ, ρ ? Are we to suppose that in the passage thus chosen (x. 1-15) this sequence of these three letters at the same fixed interval was mere accident ? The latter supposition becomes even more improbable, impossible indeed, when account is taken of the further sequence β, γ , which connects, as shown above, with the sequence ψ, γ, ρ .

The only modification of Baethgen's theory which seems to me tenable is that x. 1-15 was throughout alphabetic, and was deliberately written to be interpolated between ix. 21 and x. 16 by a later editor, who for some reason found the verses thus replaced unsuitable. This would account for the admitted sequence ψ, γ, ρ , for the further traces of alphabetic structure, for the exact dovetailing of the inserted section and for the points of connexion in thought and style between x. 1-15 and ix. + x. 16-18. But in this form the theory cannot of course derive any argument from the present alphabetic phenomena. It must depend on the difference, apparent certainly if not original, of subject. But why should an editor, who thought it necessary to interpolate a long section, have failed to make the further slight changes necessary to assimilate the subject throughout ?

Several of those who attribute the present incompleteness of the alphabetic structure to textual corruption have sought to restore the original text by transpositions. Some of these transpositions are certainly questionable. For the remnants of the alphabetic structure testify not only to the fact of textual corruption, *but also to certain limitations within which that corruption has occurred* ; they must therefore be treated as regulating factors in any reconstruction of the text. Thus treated, they go far to invalidate not only theories of large interpolation of foreign matter, but also theories of extensive transposition and omission. In so far, therefore, as they involve such transpositions I find

the theories of Bickell, Cheyne, and, in a less degree, of Duhm, improbable. For example, on Bickell's theory, among the textual corruptions are the following : (1) ix. 20, 21 have been added to the original poem ; (2) the original כ strophe consisted of x. 3 (now somewhat expanded) + x. 4 + x. 5a, and has shifted from its original position so as to follow the ל strophe, x. 1, 2 ; (3) the נ and ס strophes have fallen out clean after x. 5b (from מרום), x. 6 which constitute the original מ strophe. But all this involves this rather improbable combination of accidents : (1) the position of initial נ in the present text at the correct distance before initial פֶּעֶקְרֶשֶׁת is pure accident, for on the theory it is not the original initial נ ; (2) the ל of x. 1 is the original initial, but it has only retained its position at the correct interval after initial י by a lucky combination of changes : the assumed interpolation of ix. 20, 21 would have removed it four lines too far from initial י, but this was neutralized by four lines exactly of the כ strophe getting misplaced after the ל strophe ; (3) by accident eight consecutive lines (the נ and ס strophes) drop out between x. 6 and 7 without any such break in the sense as would indicate so considerable a loss.

Dr. Cheyne's reconstruction assumes frequent expansion of the text through the intrusion of variant readings of the same line and corresponding losses of lines. With regard to the addition of ix. 20, 21, the transpositions at the beginning of Psalm x. and the loss of exactly the eight lines of the נ and ס strophes he nearly agrees with Bickell. But further, on his theory, the occurrence of initial פ and ל at the correct interval before the initial ק is due to a lucky combination, within the twelve lines concerned, of addition and omission ; two lines have fallen out between x. 10 and x. 11, but just this quantity of matter by a curious freak of fortune has been added within the same section by the

expansion of two original lines into the four lines 9*b* and 10*a, d* of the present text.

The text of Psalms ix. and x. has certainly suffered corruption. The LXX. contains a few more correct readings than the Hebrew text, and preserves the correct division of lines in one case where the Massoretic text has destroyed it. But even conjectural emendation is justified and indeed demanded, and that to a somewhat greater extent than I have admitted in the provisional translation given above for purposes of this discussion. Exegesis that fails to take account of this, that insists on interpreting everything in the present text as the actual words of the author, must go wrong. In addition to this general conclusion, the results, briefly summarized, which an examination of the structure of the poem appears to me to offer as the starting point of sound exegesis, are these: Psalms ix. and x. are a single poem; the original poem consisted of eighty-eight lines of three or four accented words; the equivalent of four or five of these lines has been lost—the equivalent of two or three between ix. 6 and ix. 10, two lines exactly between x. 1 and x. 4. On the other hand, at no point between ix. 2–5 or ix. 10–17 or x. 6–18 has the text received addition or suffered loss to the extent of more than a word or two, but several such small losses or additions or corruptions of words are indicated by the abnormal length of the lines or the impossibility of the style.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

*PERSONAL RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE.*¹

THE title of this section of the great department of religion is somewhat ambiguous, as it might mean a discussion of the influence of the individual on religion, on religious development and organization; or it might mean the influence of religion on the individual, its effects on personal character and its special impact on the single soul. Fortunately these two subjects are cognate, and are only different sides of the one pre-eminent subject of personal religion. From whichever side we enter, we come close to the heart of faith. The real subject of this section is the place of the individual in this great matter of religion, the relation of the human soul to God.

Our subject is the climax of all the sections in this department of the Congress. All that has gone before of religious education and agencies and work lead up to this transcendent culmination in which the soul is at home with God; and the section that follows, dealing with the social influence of religion, can have meaning only in so far as religion is a living power in the hearts and lives of individuals. Indeed, this whole wonderful Congress, attempting to cover or at least to touch upon, every branch of universal knowledge, is a mighty illustration of one aspect of our subject, reminding us of all the inspiration that has come to the hearts of men and all the glory of truth that has broken upon their sight, part of the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. And still more, I make bold to say that the magnificent triumphs of human knowledge

¹ Lecture delivered at the International Congress of Science and Art, St. Louis. The department of Religion was divided into sections dealing with such subjects as Religious Education, Religious Agencies and Work. This section, entitled "Religious Influence: Personal," was followed by the section "Religious Influence: Social," and the following lecture was introductory to its particular section.

of which this Congress is a record, all the arts and sciences represented in such profusion here, would lose all their joy and lose all essential meaning if we were compelled to abandon the sphere of this humble section of personal religion. The only unity of knowledge and life and nature and the universe is God, and if we can never enter into a relation of personal communion we are only fumbling at the fringe of things, and can never get further than the fringe. All our attainments and achievements turn to dust and ashes, with no true meaning and no clear future for them, if we are shut out from any hope of spiritual fellowship. My purpose, therefore, in this lecture is not to treat of details of what religion can do for a man, or what a man can do for religion, but to impress ourselves anew with the fact that religion means the impact of God on the human soul, and the communion of the human soul with God.

This simple fact, which might be taken as an axiomatic definition of religion, needs to be enforced on our generation. In our thinking to-day, which is inevitably sociological, there is the equally inevitable danger of the individual being submerged in the mass. In practice also our social organization is becoming ever more complex, so that we are compelled to lay less and less stress on the individual. We see that man can never be considered in isolation, that he has become what he is through society, that the social reactions are responsible for every stage of his progress. The family, the industrial conditions, the civic relation, the state are not merely the different spheres in which man's abilities and energies are employed, but they have conditioned these very abilities and energies. We are what the social forces have made us. Development and environment are the great watchwords of our day, and the mighty truth in them can bear constant repetition. It carries with it much hope for the future in improved conditions and in

practical efforts for the betterment of all classes. So full are we of this thought that we attempt to explain all life and the history of all thought and progress in broad lines of cosmic development. The individual drops out of our calculations. We make less of personal initiative and more of the environment that moulds men. We are tempted to look upon the single life as merely a plastic material on which society works. And perhaps there never was more necessity for a protest and for some re-assertion of the place of the individual. The current of modern thought runs so strongly in one direction that most of our systems would have no place for this section of the Congress, a section entitled, "Personal Religious Influence," even when much would be made of the following section on "Social Religious Influence." All who know the thought of our time will admit the existence of this tendency. We find it not only in the material sciences, but even more strongly in sociology and in all the branches of history which deal with man and his progress. The modern school of history itself boldly preaches and practises this doctrine, and the importance of it for us in our present connexion is simply this, that if they are right, then there is no room for the consideration of our subject at all.

We see the tendency very marked in the protest against such teaching as that of Carlyle's doctrine of heroes, a protest made so strongly by Lord Acton, who more than any other man of our time has influenced the study of history in England. With him the great purpose in history is to get behind men and grasp thoughts. History is the growth and development of ideas, and this is true of every kind of history, political, religious, literary, or scientific. In the *Letters of Lord Acton*, recently published since his death, this is incessantly and vigorously asserted. "The vividness and force with which we trace the motion of his-

tory depends on the degree to which we look beyond persons and fix our gaze on things." This represents a useful protest against the picturesque scenery of an older school of historians, and is perhaps a necessary revolt from Carlyle's teaching. Our new historians are interested in doctrines, in principles which push things towards certain consequences, not in the passions and follies and wishes of persons. They are interested in what Lord Acton called "the impersonal forces which rule the world, such as predestination, equality, divine right, secularism, congregationalism, nationality, and whatever other religious ideas have grouped and propelled associations of men." But surely the protest has been carried too far. An impersonal idea, after all, is unthinkable. It is right in history to get past the men who played their part on the stage, but never to leave them so far out of account as to forget their real connexion with the ideas. Acton's plan for his projected *History of Liberty* would seem to assume that there is an impersonal force called liberty which somehow ground itself out and developed spontaneously. After all, as there could be no society without the individual with his contribution to make to the whole, so there could be no idea without an idealist, and no religion nor religious influence without the single soul. In the great scheme of modern history projected by Lord Acton, and being so worthily carried out by scholars in the Cambridge History, he reckoned modern history as beginning with the close of the fifteenth century, "when Columbus subverted the notions of the world and reversed the conditions of productive wealth and power; Machiavelli released Government from the restraint of law; Erasmus diverted the current of ancient learning from profane into Christian channels; Luther broke the chain of authority and tradition at the strongest link; and Copernicus erected an invincible power that set for ever the mark

of progress upon the time that was to come." Surely the very mention of the names is enough to suggest doubts as to the rigour and vigour of the theory.

The history of the world may not be, what it has been called and treated, merely the biography of great men ; but at any rate the history of the world would be different if the influence of even a few of its great men had been left out. We sometimes think we can explain a great man by our common phrase that he was the creature of his time, and there is usually much truth in the use of the phrase. The leader gets as well as gives. He cannot be put in a separate category as a thing apart, as if he were a peculiar creation, unrelated to the past and independent of the present. No man could affect his age if he were not in the fullest sense the fruit of the age, entering into its thought, knowing its problems, feeling the pulse of its life. The great world-movements do not owe their origin to one man's thought, like Minerva sprung full-grown from the brain of Jove. They grow from the needs of the time, the slowly gathering vital forces that must find outlet. The Reformation, for example, was greater than the reformers greater than Luther or Calvin or Knox. In its political aspect it was the breaking of bonds in Western Europe that had become intolerable. In its inner aspect it was the movement of the soul of man towards liberty of mind and conscience, towards a fuller knowledge, a truer faith, a purer worship. But the acknowledged truth of all this gives us no warrant for imagining that we have explained the great man by calling him the creature of his time. If he brought no free and individual force to the situation, the situation would only be where it was. Granted that the Reformation would have been without Luther, there would need to be some other sort of Luther somewhere else, or, if you prefer it, some score of pigmy Luthers to do his work.

There could be no Reformation without at least some kind of reformers.

This modern tendency to ascribe historical events to vague causes as opposed to personal influence needs to be checked by the absolute truth that nothing has ever been, or can ever be, accomplished in the way of progress without a distinct and definite personal agency. As Dr. Harnack, the great Church historian, whose presence at this Congress gives even such a gathering distinction, says, "History tells us that no aspiration and no progress have ever existed without the miraculous exertion of an individual will, of a *person*. It was not what the person said that was new and strange—he came when the time was fulfilled and spoke what the time required—but how he said it ; how it became in him the strength and power of a new life ; how he transmitted it to his disciples. That was his secret, and that was what was new in him."¹

It is a foolish way to treat history as if it were in a vacuum, the whirl of impersonal forces without father or mother or any definite connexion. We have become so scientific to-day with our tendencies and streams of influence and movements of thought, though it is not easy to see how there can be spiritual tendencies without spiritual beings, and moral influence without moral life, and movements of thought without thinkers. As if there were in the world man but not men, the generic man without the individual ! It is of a piece with so many arguments of political economists about human life in terms of x and y , and their talk of the masses, as if the masses were not composed of units each with his own heart's bitterness and his heart's joy. We play with words when we talk of tendencies and movements, as if we were really accounting for anything by the use of words like these ; and our preference of such

¹ *Christianity and History*, p. 35.

general terms to acknowledging the creative influence of individuals is part of the latent infidelity which dislikes to admit *creation* in any sphere, the launching of a force straight from the hand and the heart of God.

It is thus we find room for revelation and a place for personal religion, a place for communion with God, and the influence of all that religion stands for on the single human soul ; and thus also we find room for the unique place an inspired and consecrated soul can have in his generation, influencing others and lifting life to a higher level. If a generation has any distinctive character at all, it is and must be the fruit of personal character. And it is here in this region that religion does its permanent work. In its ultimate issue religion consists of a relation of the soul to God. Religion is Communion, entering into and living in a relationship of love and service and obedience to God. The abiding power of our Christian faith is that Christ brings us into this relation of simple trust and loving dependence on our Heavenly Father. Religious influence, then, is personal before it can be social. It brings the individual into the presence of God. There is a moment which came to the prophets and to men called to exceptional work, a moment when the world is dissolved, when earth has faded and heaven has opened and reveals the eternal, a moment when in all the universe there seems nothing but God and the human soul. That moment altered the perspective of everything afterwards to the Hebrew prophets ; they read everything in the light of that moment, and when in the future they were brought up against seemingly impassable difficulties and things that seemed irreconcilable with their faith, they simply fell back upon God ; for they knew that whatever else might be false that great experience must be true.

To most of us our religious assurance does not come in

that direct fashion : it is *mediated* to us, so to speak. It is brought to us by human hands. From soul to soul the flame leaps and spreads. The fire is kindled from the living glow in another's heart. But even so, we are still in the same mysterious region of personality, the holy of holies of the human spirit where God meets with man and man tastes the power of endless life. The unique work of Christ is that He proves Himself to be the way of access to God. To see Him is to see the Father. All that is implied in the Christian faith originated in a life, the life of the Master ; and its perfect work is done when other lives are moved by the same spirit. The heart of religion lies not in adherence to an abstract system of thought, not acceptance of certain great truths, nor even reverence of great moral principles, but adherence to that thought and truth and morality as they are revealed in a great personality, as they are incarnated in a life. The dynamic of religion is personal love ; the driving power is found in the devotion of the disciple to his Lord. Every great religion has had this personal note, and Christianity has it in a pre-eminent degree. It asks for discipleship, demands submission to the authority of Christ, and can be satisfied with nothing less than personal spiritual relations with Him. This is why the faith can be universal, since it asks not for intellectual assent to propositions, but personal loyalty to a matchless personality, and is not an idle sentiment but a power in actual life, presenting an ideal to every man that sees the vision. It is not a system of teaching merely, but a new principle of life which takes root and assimilates elements of its environment transforming them into new forms of life. The beginning of this process is when a man becomes a Christian, when he opens heart and life to the influence of Jesus ; but that is only the beginning of a process the goal of which is that he is a man *in whom Christ lives*. It is a

spiritual transformation after the image of Christ. No part of the being of man is to be left out of this great scheme ; the body and its members are to be the body and members of Christ, and to be treated as such ; the mind is to be the mind of Christ ; the heart is to be the seat and throne and sanctuary of Christ. What a magnificent ideal this New Testament conception is of the Christ-birth in a man till he becomes a veritable re-incarnation, until he is no longer he but Christ, re clothed in flesh and human attributes by Him, so that he can say with some measure of truth, as St. Paul could say, " I live, yet not, I, but Christ liveth in me."

The psychology of it is that we bring every thought into subjection to the obedience of Christ, superimposing Christ's will and mind over ours, desiring to serve and please Him and not ourselves, making Him in all things our conscience and bringing everything to the test of that conscience. We let Him colour opinion and thought and judgment and desire and ambition and hope, transforming them all into His glorious purpose. The bond of personal attachment is the deepest thing in religion. And as a matter of historical fact Christ's personality has been the dominating power in the Christian religion. The Christian character is modelled on His character. The Christian mind is the same mind as was in Jesus Christ. Only this personal element can give the necessary motive for true living. We know in practice that to be aware of the truth of a thing is quite different from possessing its power. We know what moral inability is. A man may know the right and desire the right and sincerely will the right ; and yet cannot do the thing he would. He needs to be infused by a personal power that will carry him over the things that stand in the way of his will. He needs a larger and higher love that will give him the victory. This Christ gives, so that His lover can say, " I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth

me." Faith is needed before moral effort can be successful, a faith that merges into a personal love. Christ the Teacher is also the Saviour ; the Revealer is also the Redeemer. He redeems by revealing ; He reveals by redeeming. Thus the Christian life is the imitation of Christ ; and this is the power of His teaching, that it is Himself and not merely His sayings we follow. Christ never says to us, "Go," without also saying "Come." He goes with us. To go to any duty, any command, any cross even, means to follow Him. This personal touch, personal communion, personal love, is the unique power of Christian ethics. He who gives us the victory stands in our battle.

I do not speak of the details of this mighty personal influence, the practical effects of this communion. I do not speak of the peace and rest of heart which faith produces, the way in which the character is made strong and true. The important thing after all is to get to the source, the living fountain of strength and beauty of life. All effective social work of religion, to be treated in the next section this afternoon, depends on our being right here. It is personal religion which can give equipment for social service. If our life is poor within and our character is weak, our religious work will effect little. The ultimate value of a man's work is what he is. That is primarily of more importance than what he does. His power of real service is conditioned by his personal worth, his character. True religion deepens and enriches the quality of the life.

We need to have the personal note back into our confession if our religious testimony is to be effective, moving men's hearts with the pang of desire, convincing the world of God. We were born for the love of God. It is written in the needs of our nature, in the wants of our heart. Until we submit and enter into the blessed fellowship we are orphaned and desolate. "Thou hast made us for Thyself,

and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee." That word of the great Augustine sums up our life, and points to what personal religion may be to us, when the heart is fixed on God.

HUGH BLACK.

WHAT IS "THE COMMUNION OF THE HOLY GHOST" ?

THE most familiar words are not always the best understood ; and not only multitudes of those who have listened to the Apostolic Benediction, but even many of those who have repeated it hundreds of times, would probably have to confess that they attach no definite meaning to " the communion of the Holy Ghost." If the notions of those who do attach any definite meaning to the phrase were put into words, they would be found to differ widely from one another. At all events commentators are at variance among themselves, many seeming to grasp at explanations suggested only by the sound of the words. Among older scholars it was not unusual to adopt the interpretation, which is probably that of the uneducated, that it signifies fellowship, or worshipping intercourse, with the Holy Ghost. Among interpreters of recent date, both Schmiedel, in the *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, and Dean Bernard, in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, understand it of the fellowship among saints due to the Holy Ghost. Meyer seems only to allow the sense of " participation " in the Holy Ghost, the verbal idea involved in the noun being taken in a middle sense ; and of course his is a weighty vote.

But, if the balance and harmony of the three clauses of the Apostolic Benediction be assumed, then the primary meaning must be something akin to " grace " and " love."

"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" and "the love of God" are ideas perfectly parallel, and the third clause must denote something belonging to the Holy Ghost akin to "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" and "the love of God." "Communion," however, does not express this. The rendering in the Vulgate, and in some of the European versions derived therefrom, is "communication"; and this would supply the requisite sense; for it might mean the disposition to communicate or the habit of communicating—an idea exactly parallel to "love" and "grace."

This active meaning of the word can be sustained by several passages of the New Testament. Thus, in Hebrews xiii. 16, we read, "To do good and to communicate forget not," where, although "to communicate" sounds like a verb, it is really a noun and the very same word rendered "communion" in the Apostolic Benediction. In 2 Corinthians ix. 13, the writer, speaking of a collection of money, says: "They glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ and for your liberal distribution unto them and unto all men," "distribution" being the same word. In Romans xv. 26, it is actually the name for a collection—"It hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." In another passage, referring to the same class of subjects (2 Cor. viii. 3, 4), it is most suggestively coupled with "grace," as in the Apostolic Benediction: only the grace is not that of God but of man: "According to their power, I bear witness, yea, and beyond their power, they gave of their own accord, beseeching us with much entreaty in regard to this grace and the fellowship in the ministering to the saints" (R.V.). Here "grace" and "fellowship" are as nearly as possible identical, and either of them might be rendered by "liberality"; as, indeed, the former, in the same sense, is rendered in 1 Corin-

thians xvi. 3. And here we have discovered the term of which we are in quest. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" and "the love of God" have as their parallel "the liberality of the Holy Ghost." As "love" is the supreme characteristic of the Father and "grace" that of the Son, so is "liberality" that of the Holy Ghost; and thus, in this great proof-text for the doctrine of the Trinity, the personality of this gracious Being is far more pointedly expressed than in the ordinary translation.

It is a well-known characteristic of words of this class—that is, nouns of giving—that, from denoting primarily the quality of a giver, they may pass on to denote, secondarily, the gift which this quality prompts him to bestow. Thus, "the king's bounty" may mean either the kindness and magnanimity for which he is distinguished or a sum of money given by him on certain occasions. When, in ordinary parlance, we speak of the "liberality" of a church or a congregation, we may mean either its generosity of spirit or the amount of its givings for a year. On the same principle, the "liberality" of the Holy Ghost may mean either His disposition to communicate or the sum of the gifts which He communicates. The gifts of the Holy Spirit, or, as they are more commonly called, "spiritual gifts," are a frequent theme in the New Testament, especially in that part of it to which the Apostolic Benediction belongs—the writings to the Corinthians. There we read: "To one is given, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another faith, by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing, by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues" (1 Cor. xii. 8-10). Detailed as this list is, it does not include all the

gifts of the Spirit. Some of these are given to all Christians, others to chosen individuals ; some were given only in the apostolic age, others are given in every age ; some are given for the salvation of the individual, others for the extension and development of the Church. Such are the manifold gifts of the Spirit ; they are all summed up in " the communion of the Holy Ghost " ; and, when the Apostle prays that " the communion of the Holy Ghost " may be with his correspondents, the scope of his intercession is obvious : it is that the Holy Ghost may be present among them, distributing to everyone all that is essential to his holiness, happiness and usefulness, " that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," and supplying to the body of Christians all the gifts requisite for the victory of the Gospel as a public cause.¹

There is a tertiary meaning which I divine in this phrase, but about which, I confess, I am not so sure. A word like this may move round not only from denoting a quality in the giver to denote the gift in which this is embodied, but so far as to denote the effect of the gift on the receiver. " Grace " is first a quality of Jesus Christ ; then it is a name for the Christian salvation ; but, thirdly, it describes the character of one in whom this salvation has taken effect : he is a " gracious " person, he has " grace " in himself. In the same way, " the love of God " is first a quality of the Father ; then it is embodied in the gift of His Son ; but, when this takes effect, it always produces love in man ; and there are many passages in the New Testament where it is impossible to determine whether " the love of God " means the love of God to man or the

¹ This reference to the spiritual gifts has been most clearly recognised by Calvin ; and, indeed, this exegete's whole discussion of " the communion of the Holy Ghost " is luminous and suggestive in the extreme.

love of man to God. Now, may "the communion of the Holy Ghost" mean the liberality produced by the Holy Ghost?¹ Whether it may or not, at all events it is a glorious truth that, when the Spirit of God touches the spirit of man, it makes it like itself; and he who participates in the communication of the Holy Ghost thereby becomes a spiritual power, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, or, to employ the remarkable language of our Lord, out of him "shall flow rivers of living water."

JAMES STALKER.

TARSUS.

XVIII. THE TARSIAN DEMOCRACY.

THE importance attached to Tarsian citizenship and expressed in the hasty words of St. Paul (Acts xxi. 39) quoted in a previous section, was greatly increased by the changes introduced during the reign of Augustus into the constitution of Tarsus. The changes were introduced through the instrumentality of Athenodorus, the only Tarsian besides Paul himself who stands out before us as a real person; and an account of them will make the municipality of Tarsus more intelligible, and will at the same time illustrate to the reader the personality of a noteworthy Tarsian.

Under the careless and corrupt rule of Antony in the East, Tarsus was exposed to suffer from the caprices and the favourites of an idle despot. A certain Boëthos, "bad poet and bad citizen," as Strabo calls him, a native of Tarsus, was patronized by Antony, whose favour he had gained by a poem celebrating the battle of Philippi. The vice of

¹ "Holy-Ghost-liberality" would exactly express this idea, if it were permissible to use a phrase which belongs rather to the *patois* than to the language of Canaan.

Greek democratic government was the careless readiness to embark in any new scheme that caught the popular taste and to employ any leader who suggested himself as likely to further the enterprise of the moment.¹ Boêthos knew well how to make use of the Tarsian democracy for his own benefit, and he allied himself with a gang of corrupt associates to plunder the municipality. After the fall of Antony in the end of 31 B.C., the personal influence of Boêthos in Tarsus was weakened; but the gang had apparently got possession of the machinery of government, and there was no great improvement in the administration. Then Athenodorus came back to Tarsus, invested with the influence that belonged to a personal friend of the Emperor Augustus, and apparently holding also in reserve a commission from the supreme ruler to reform the constitution of Tarsus as he might find expedient. The way in which Athenodorus had risen to this high position in the Imperial administration is interesting in itself, and gives a remarkable view of the character of that period and of the importance which then belonged to education: see § XIX.

As to Boêthos, nothing is known except what we can gather from the brief account in Strabo. He stands before us a type of the worst product of Greek democracy, the skilful manipulator of popular government for the benefit of a clique of corrupt and unscrupulous partisans. It is true that we know about him only from a friend and admirer of his opponent, Athenodorus; but the facts stand out so natural and so life-like in Strabo's pages that they are convincing. Tarsus fell under the control of a ring similar to that Tammany ring which long controlled New York in our own time; and the situation was the same in both cities. The influence of the more educated body of the

¹ ἡ εὐχέρεια ἢ ἐπιπολάζουσα παρὰ τοῖς Ταρσεῦσιν ὥστ' ἀπαύστως σχεδιάζειν παρὰ χρῆμα πρὸς τὴν δεδομένην ὑπόθεσιν (Strab. p. 674).

citizens was weakened, in the one case through the disorders of the Civil War, followed by the capricious and corrupt rule of Antony, in the other case by the absorption of the educated citizens in other pursuits and their withdrawal from the work of municipal government.

The name Boêthos might suggest the suspicion that he was a Jew. It is known to have been borne by Jews, and it was undoubtedly favoured by them as a Greek translation of the Hebrew name Ozer or Ezra.¹ But there is no reason to think that the name was confined to Jews ; and the skill which Boêthos showed in manipulating the machinery of municipal administration was not, and never has been, confined to Jews. This bad poet is perhaps more likely to have been a Greek ; and it was at any rate through clever handling of the most worthless elements of Greek city life that he obtained his position in history.

XIX. ATHENODORUS OF TARSUS.

Athenodorus was a citizen of Tarsus,² born not in the city itself, but in "a certain village" of its territory, as Strabo says. The name of the village must have been Kanana ; and therefrom was formed the epithet Kananites, by which this Athenodorus was distinguished from another Tarsian philosopher, of slightly earlier date,³ who bore the same name. Both lived long in Rome, each was the confidential friend of a noble Roman, one of Cato, the other of Augustus, both were Stoics ; and confusion between them was easy.⁴

¹ See Herzog in *Philologus*, vol. lvi. p. 45, and Th. Reinach in *Revue des Études Juives*, 1893, p. 166 f.

² The suggestion which I made in *Hastings' Dictionary*, iv. p. 687, that he might have been born at Kanna in Lycaonia, and educated in Tarsus, must therefore be set aside.

³ He was living in extreme old age as late as 47 B.C., and was distinguished by the surname Kordylion.

⁴ I was guilty of this confusion in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 354. I noticed this slip only after the present article was nearly finished.

The village origin and the name of his father, Sandon—a thoroughly Cilician name—mark Athenodorus as belonging to the native element in the Tarsian state.¹

The life of Athenodorus extended from about 74 B.C. to 7 A.D. He died in his eighty-second year, and he was the teacher of the youthful Augustus at Apollonia in Epirus. Now the residence of Augustus at Apollonia ended in the spring of 44 B.C., and it is hardly possible that Athenodorus was less than thirty years of age at that time. Eusebius, in his chronicle, says that he was famous in 7 A.D.; this statement must be understood of the culmination of his career in Tarsus (to which he returned in old age), and his death may be placed in the same or an immediately following year, 7–9 A.D. He was born, therefore, between 74 and 72 B.C.; and the earlier dates 74 B.C. and 7 A.D. are probably preferable for the limits of his life (as will appear in the sequel), and as such will be here adopted.

Athenodorus is mentioned in such close relation with Posidonius,² the leader of the Stoic school of philosophy at Rhodes, that he may be confidently called his pupil. He studied, therefore, at Rhodes under that teacher before A.D. 51, when Posidonius migrated, near the end of his long life of 84 years, to Rome. After concluding his studies Athenodorus may be presumed, according to the usual custom, to have travelled, completing his education by acquiring experience of the world and life. His writings (as we shall see) prove that his travels extended beyond the Greek world into the Eastern desert.

Although I have more than once had to write about Athenodorus since then, I did not observe that the error had infected my own work.

¹ The supposition of Jewish origin (above, p. 147) must probably be rejected, though the epithet Kananites (variant in Matt. x. 4, Mark, iii. 18, for *Kavavios*, see Herzog, *Philologus*, lvi. p. 51) strongly suggests Jewish race. Strabo's statement that the surname was derived ἀπὸ κώμης τινός must be accepted in the case of his personal friend.

² Strab. pp. 6 and 55: in the Epitome Diog. the order of enumeration is Posidonius, Athenodorus, Antipater.

We may also confidently assume that he must have given lectures in some of the great cities of the Mediterranean lands. It was in this way that young aspirants to philosophic distinction made themselves known in educated circles, and in time found a home and a career in some part of the Greek world ; and it was as one of those travelling philosophers that Paul afterwards found a hearing in those Greek cities. After some years spent in this kind of probation as a lecturer, Athenodorus settled at Apollonia on the coast of Epirus. Either there or during his *Wanderjahre* he acquired so high and widespread a reputation that Cicero, writing from Asia Minor in February, B.C. 50 to Appius Claudius, then censor in Rome, advised him to direct his attention to what Athenodorus, son of Sandon, says about nobility.¹ As it seems highly improbable that Athenodorus had come to Rome before 51 B.C.,² it is evident that Cicero must have learned about his opinions from his writings, and advised Claudius to study some treatise by him on moral philosophy. We can hardly suppose that this great reputation had been acquired before he was twenty-three ; and therefore 74 must be assumed as the year of his birth. An earlier date is impossible, for he was living as late as A.D. 7.

Athenodorus was lecturing at Apollonia when the youthful Augustus came there to finish his education in the autumn of 45 B.C. In the six months which Augustus spent there the Tarsian philosopher acquired a life-long influence over his mind. It can have been no ordinary man who so deeply impressed a subtle and self-reliant character like Augustus. When the latter returned to Rome to take up the inheritance of his uncle Julius Caesar in March 44 B.C. Athenodorus followed him. In November of that year he was consulted by Cicero, and prepared for his use in his treatise *De Officio*

¹ Cicero *ad Fam.* iii. 7, 5.

² Cicero left Rome for his Cilician Province in 51.

an abstract of Posidonius's opinions on duty : it is clear from Cicero's words¹ that Athenodorus was then in Rome.

He remained many years in Rome, enjoying a position of trust and influence with Augustus. The relations between them were creditable to both. Augustus is said to have been guided by the wise advice of the philosopher ; and Athenodorus never abused the influence that he enjoyed. A story which is related by Dion Cassius, and more fully by Zonaras, shows that he had the courage to run serious risk in his determination to rebuke and curb the faults of his Imperial friend. He chanced one day, to enter the house of a noble Roman friend, and found the family in affliction. An order had come from Augustus that the wife of this noble must go instantly to meet Augustus in the palace, and a closely covered litter was waiting to convey her. It was not doubtful that the purpose was a dishonourable one ; but no one in this Roman high-born family dared to think of disobeying the autocrat. It was the village-born philosopher who was bold enough to do so.

Athenodorus immediately offered his services. He took his place in the litter, with a drawn sword in his hand. When he had been carried thus into Augustus's chamber and the litter was set down, he leaped out suddenly, sword in hand, exclaiming, " Are you not afraid lest some one may enter like this and assassinate you ? " Augustus was convinced, and Athenodorus's influence was increased by the Emperor's gratitude.

In this incident we recognize a man who possessed a clear insight into character, quick wit, decision and courage. He knew both what he ought to blame, and how the blame should be conveyed so as to impress the cautious and subtle mind of Augustus.

¹ *Ad Att.* xvi. 11, 4 ; 14, 4. Cicero asks Atticus who was in Rome to urge Athenodorus to hurry.

In his old age Athenodorus obtained permission to retire to his native city ; and, as he was taking leave and embracing his old pupil, he imparted his last piece of advice, " When you are angry, Caesar, say nothing and do nothing until you have repeated to yourself the letters of the alphabet." Here again we observe the watchful affection which noted and tried to guard against the faults of his friend. Augustus, taking his hand and saying, " I have still need of you," detained him a year longer, quoting the Greek poet's word, " Silence, too," i.e. the silence of long and trusty companionship, quite as much as military service, " brings a reward, which is unaccompanied by danger." This was a principle of Augustus's policy, expressed by Horace in the second Ode of the third book (one of a group of six thoroughly political poems), *est et fidei tuta silentio merces*.¹

As Athenodorus seems to have spent his life near Augustus from 45 B.C. until he retired to Tarsus about 15 B.C., it must have been during those early years which (as we saw) he probably spent in travel, that he visited Petra, in the desert east of the Dead Sea. He related with admiration that, whereas the many strangers whom he saw there, Romans and others, were frequently engaged in lawsuits against one another or against the natives, none of the natives ever were involved in any dispute with each other, but all lived in perfect mutual harmony.² Clement of Alexandria quotes from him a statement that Sesostris the Egyptian king, after conquering many peoples among the Greeks, brought back artists with him to Egypt, and thus explained the origin of a statue of Sarapis. He may, therefore, have visited Egypt as well as Petra, and thence derived illustrations for his philosophical writings and lectures.

¹ ἔστι καὶ συγῆς ἀκλόνου γέρας.

² Strabo, p. 779.

Athenodorus is called a philosopher of nature (*φυσικός*) by Eusebius,¹ and, with his master Poseidonios, he is twice quoted by Strabo for his opinions on the ocean and tides.² Whether he or another Athenodorus of Tarsus was the author of a work on his fatherland, quoted by Stephanus Byzantinus, is uncertain ; but as the work gives a different account of the origin of Tarsus from that which is stated by Strabo, the friend of our Athenodorus, Müller infers, with much probability, that the author was a different Athenodorus.

The work by which he impressed the world was in the department of moral philosophy ; and in his treatises he embodied a noble and dignified view of human life and duty. On that account he was commended by Cicero and quoted by Seneca, from whom is derived the little that we know of his teaching.

Seneca, when he mentions that in society some reckon to our account the social attentions which we pay them, as if they were putting us in their debt by admitting us to the privilege of their acquaintance, quotes the saying of Athenodorus that he would not even go to dine with a person who would not think the guest was conferring an obligation by resorting to his house.³ In another place Seneca quotes at considerable length his opinion that, in a better state of society, it would be the best way of life to exercise and strengthen one's character by engaging in public life ; but, as society is at present constituted, since ambition and calumny are rampant, and the simple, candid person is constantly exposed to misrepresentation, a noble

¹ In his *Chronica*, A.D. 7, Jerome, in his translation of the Chronicle, modifies the expression and calls him a Stoic philosopher, evidently because he knew from other sources that Athenodorus belonged to that school.

² Strabo, pp. 6, 55 ; and above, p. 173.

³ *De Tranq. Anim.* 7.

nature is bound to abstain from public life. Yet even in private life a great mind can find free scope, and be useful to private friends and to the whole body of the people by wise speech and good counsel.¹ This passage, with its lofty view of life, bears a distinct resemblance to that conception of life as a warfare against evil, which Seneca and Paul express in remarkably similar terms.

Again, in his *Moral Epistles*, i. 10, 5, Seneca quotes from him the striking sentiment, "Know that you are free from all passions only when you have reached the point that you ask God for nothing except what you can ask openly ; and he goes on to say, in the spirit if not in the words of Athenodorus, "So live with men, as if God saw you ; so speak with God, as if men were listening."

He wrote a treatise addressed to Octavia the sister of Augustus, of which nothing is known, but which may, perhaps, have been a consolation on the death of her son, Marcellus—a kind of work which was reckoned specially appropriate for philosophers in Roman society, and of which Seneca's Consolation to his own mother Helvia, may be taken as a specimen.

In this summary of the few known events of his life Athenodorus stands before us as a personage of real distinction and lofty character, no mere empty lecturer and man of words, but a man of judgment, good sense, courage and self-respect, who stooped to no base subservience to a despot, but rebuked his faults sharply, when the greatest in Rome were cowering in abject submission before him, a man of affairs who knew what were his limits and did not overstep them, and a writer every one of whose few preserved sayings is noble and generous. The opinion has been stated in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 354, and is still maintained by the writer, that the remarkable resemblance, both verbal

¹ Ibid. 3.

and in spirit, which has often been observed between the sentiments expressed by Seneca and the words of St. Paul¹ is due at least in part to the influence exercised on both by Athenodorus ; and if this be true, every one must admit that no writer of antiquity, so far as we know, better deserved, both by his life and by his sentiments, to exercise such an influence on two of the greatest figures in the history of the first century after Christ. Paul can hardly have been more than an infant when the greatest of pagan Tarsians died. But the influence of Athenodorus did not die with him. He was long worshipped as a hero by his country,² and his teaching was doubtless influential in the University of Tarsus after his death.

This account has been strictly confined to the exact facts that are recorded. It would be possible from the analogy of other cities and from the general circumstances of contemporary history to restore something like a picture of Athenodorus in his Tarsian activity—for his retirement was merely the beginning of a new period of practical work—but that kind of imagination of what is likely to have been belongs to the province of historical romance rather than of history.

XX. THE REFORM OF THE TARSIAN CONSTITUTION BY ATHENODORUS.

It is not possible to fix the time when Athenodorus returned to Tarsus ; but, as he was an old man (so both Plutarch and Strabo say), it cannot have been earlier than 15 B.C., when he was sixty years of age ; and it is not likely to have been much later, as he found Boëthos still influential in the city and busied with his gang in harrying the State.

¹ See especially Lightfoot's judicious essay "St. Paul and Seneca" in his edition of Philippians.

² Plutarch.

The terms in which Strabo describes the situation when Athenodorus returned suggest that the interval since the fall of Antony had not been very long. In Tarsus it was a case of democracy run to seed, emancipated from the limits of order and even of decency, contemptuous of obedience or principle : such was always the result of Greek institutions divorced from a general sentiment of patriotism and religion (the two were almost the same in the true Hellenic thought), which might enforce a certain standard of public action and morality.

Greek democratic government demanded a high level of education and thought among the population, and quickly resulted in anarchy when this condition was not supplied. The demand for education was strong in the democratically governed cities and the care taken to provide it was the best feature of their administration ; but the amalgamation of democratic government and the capricious autocracy of Antony had been fatal.

Athenodorus tried, first of all, the method of constitutional agitation for reform, attempting by reason and argument to restrain Boëthos and his gang, and to re-introduce a higher standard of municipal morality. After a time, finding that fair means were unavailing, and that his appeals were only met with the extreme of insult, he made use of the supreme powers ¹ with which he had been armed by Augustus and which, at first, he had apparently kept private. He condemned the whole gang to exile and ejected them from Tarsus, and revolutionized the constitution of the city.² This event may perhaps, be dated about 10 B.C., allowing a space of five years (which is probably the extremest possible limit to the patience of the philosopher).

¹ *ἐξουσία* is the word used by Strabo, which illustrates the meaning that necessarily belongs to it in 1 Cor. xi. 6 (discussed above in section xvi.).

² *κατέλυσε τὴν καθεστῶσαν πολιτείαν.*

Strabo does not state the character of the new system which Athenodorus introduced, but merely describes the intense love for education which characterized the Tarsians in his time—he was writing about A.D. 19—and evidently regards the reforms of Athenodorus, who was his personal friend, as having been extremely successful.

The general character of the new constitution which was introduced into Tarsus can be determined from the tone of the Imperial policy throughout the Empire and from the slight references made incidentally in the two speeches which Dion Chrysostom addressed to the Tarsians about A.D. 112. Although the Roman Imperial system was established through the victory of the democracy, it was a democracy led by a dictator; and Augustus recognized from a very early stage in his career that he must found his autocracy on oligarchy, not on democracy. His aim was to substitute for the old oligarchy of Roman nobles, who had formerly opposed him and could not be trusted to support his rule, a new oligarchy of official service and merit.¹ He did not try to force this on too rapidly and he was ready and eager to admit into the new oligarchy all members of the old oligarchy, who could be induced to accommodate themselves to it; but he and the rest of the early Emperors fully recognized that their greatest danger lay in possible rivals among the old nobility, and they encouraged and developed the rise of an official class, whose career should lie within the limits of the Imperial system. A bureaucratic oligarchy is the necessary accompaniment of an autocracy, which cannot maintain itself alone without some body of devoted supporters and servants to rest upon; but an educated people is its enemy. Thus, with the triumph of the popular party under the leadership of a

¹ His principle was expressed in the words quoted from Horace, *Odes*, iii. 2, 25: see § XIX.

dictator, the power of the people ended ; and a narrow oligarchy aided the Imperial despot to rule over and for a people among whom education gradually died out. The saving grace of the Empire was the memory of its origin and the compelling force of that memory. Centuries elapsed before the Emperors were able quite to forget that they had been placed in power as the champions of the people, and that the theoretical expression of their authority was the Tribunician power by which the years of their reign were reckoned. In numerous edicts the Emperors expressed their conception of their prime duty, to be ever on the outlook for opportunities to benefit their people, to think for them, and to direct them for their own good ; but it was no part of the Imperial duty to educate the people up to the level of thinking for themselves and governing themselves.

In the cities of the Empire the same process was encouraged ; the power of the people was curtailed and an oligarchical régime was gradually introduced. Tarsus was one of the first examples of the new system, and Athenodorus was the instrument through whom the Emperor acted. A certain property qualification was required for citizenship. Those who had less than the requisite fortune were degraded from the roll of citizens. In the time of Dion Chrysostom these unclassed people of Tarsus were called "Linen workers," probably a cant name which had gradually established itself in common use. They were the plebeians of Tarsus, in a sense citizens, because they were inhabitants of the city, but yet not citizens (as Dion says), because they had not the rights of a citizen.

The citizens or burgesses of Tarsus, therefore, were a timocratic aristocracy, whose status rested on a property qualification, and who exercised the powers of government and held the right of election and voting generally. Within this oligarchic body, again, there was an inner aristocracy

of the Roman citizens, viz., the families which had so conspicuously raised themselves within the city, by wealth or by holding high office or, as was usually the case, by both, as to be admitted into the governing class of the Empire. In estimating the position of the young Paul, as he grew up in Tarsus, this privileged and aristocratic position which he inherited must be taken into account.

As a general rule it was from the local aristocracy that the leading figures in Anatolian history during the Roman period sprang. The lower classes were cut off by a chasm difficult to cross from the opportunity of gaining the education that was indispensable to advancement. For example, the aristocratic tone of Basil and his brother Gregory, during the fourth century, makes itself clearly felt in their writings. They belonged to the class of landed proprietors whose fortune opened to them the path of education. The scorn of Gregory for the low birth and poverty of the heretic Eunomius is quite as conspicuous as his hatred for the heterodoxy of his opponent's religious views.¹ Education was indispensable to advancement and influence under the Empire ; even a soldier could rarely rise without education ; a civilian practically never. The vice of the Imperial system was that the distinction of educated and uneducated became a matter of birth and caste, and that the lines of class distinction grew harder and deeper until they became impassable barriers. The able freedmen were only partially an exception ; they could make money, and a career was open to their sons ; but their opportunities were in considerable degree due to the aristocratic families of whom they were dependents.

Athenodorus was succeeded in his commanding position in

¹ In the *Quarterly Review*, vol. 186, p. 420 ff., there is an article on Society in the Eastern Roman Provinces during the fourth century in which this is brought out.

the Tarsian state by Nestor, another Tarsian philosopher (of the Academic, not the Stoic, school), who had risen at Rome to influence and trust in the Imperial family and had been tutor to Augustus's nephew and intended successor Marcellus about 26-23 B.C. Nestor lived to the age of ninety-two and was still living when Strabo wrote about A.D. 19. He had doubtless been recommended by Athenodorus to Augustus. Thus Tarsus was swayed in a critical period of its history by a succession of philosophers, who combined the learning of the schools with that practical sense which alone could have won the confidence of Augustus.

XXI. INFLUENCE OF TARSUS UPON ST. PAUL.

The late Dean Howson, in an interesting little book on the *Metaphors of St. Paul*, well described the difference between the Old and the New Testaments in regard to the range and character of figurative language. In the New Testament "we find ourselves in contact with circumstances far more nearly resembling those which surround us in modern life; we are on the borders or in the heart of Greek civilization and we are always in the midst of the Roman Empire." Especially is this the case with St. Paul. He was a master of all the education and the opportunities of his time. He turned to his profit and to the advancement of his great purpose all the resources of civilization. He draws his illustrations from the range of his thoughts and his knowledge, and reveals through them his education and his interests.

Dean Howson points out that "his metaphors are usually drawn, not from the operations and phenomena of the natural world, but from the activities and the outward manifestations of human life," and that in this respect he stands in marked contrast with most of the writers in the Bible.

“The vapour, the wind, the fountain, beasts and birds and serpents, the flower of the grass, the waves of the sea, the early and latter rain, the sun risen with a burning heat—these are like the figures of the ancient prophets, and there is more imagery of this kind in the one short Epistle of St. James than in all the speeches and letters of St. Paul put together.”¹

Paul's favourite figures are taken from the midst of the busiest human society and city life, e.g. from the market—“Owe no man anything, but to love one another” (Rom. xiii. 8); “I am a debtor both to Jew” (Rom. i. 14); “Make your market to the full of the opportunity” (which the world offers (Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5); “wages” (Rom. vi. 23); and the word “riches” is a specially characteristic mark of his style. He is rarely interested in the phenomena of nature or the scenery of country life. Where he draws his illustrations from the country and from agriculture, he chiefly “deals with human labour and its useful results.” There are, of course, some isolated exceptions, as when he spoke to the uneducated rustic mob of Lystra, a small town dependent on agriculture and pasturage, not on commerce and exchange, about the “rain from heaven and fruitful seasons.” Yet even here we notice the idea of fruit. This is peculiarly characteristic of Paul. The idea of development, of growth culminating in fruit, a process leading to an end in riches and usefulness—this always appeals strongly to him. It occurs, e.g. in Philippians i. 11, 22, iv. 17; Galatians v. 19–23; Colossians i. 6, 10; Ephesians v. 8, 9, 11; Romans i. 13, vi. 21–23, vii. 4, 5, xv. 28; 2 Corinthians ix. 10; Titus iii. 14, etc. His philosophy rests mainly on this idea of growth and development. He looks on the world as the development of a purpose; the world is always fluid and changing, never stationary, but the change is the purpose

¹ Howson, p. 131.

of God, working itself out amid the errors and the wickedness, the deliberate sin, of men.

He is specially fond of expressing the same idea through a metaphor taken from the stadium. The person in whom the purpose of God works, redeeming him from his sin and setting him in the divine path, fulfils his course and runs his race. He uses this figure very often—about the word of the Lord (2 Thess. iii. 1; compare Heb. xii. 1); about John the Baptist (Acts xiii. 25); about himself (Acts xx. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 7, Phil. ii. 16, Gal. ii. 2); and in a general way, Romans ix. 16, 2 Corinthians ix. 24, 26, Galatians v. 7, etc. This figure of the runner in the foot-race is peculiar in the New Testament to him and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The latter was certainly a Hellenistic Jew. A strait and narrow Hebrew, hating all things Greek and Western, could never have compared the Divine life to the course in the stadium, and done this so persistently as to show that the thought lay in the very fabric of his mind.

The language of the athletic ground is extraordinarily frequent in Paul, and in him alone in the New Testament.¹ In 2 Timothy iv. 7–8, “I have fought the good fight” is not a military, but an athletic metaphor: “I have played a good game” is the correspondent in modern slang; literally, “I have competed in the honourable contest, I have run the race to the finish,² I have observed (the rules of) the faith.” Similarly in 1 Timothy vi. 12, there is no reference to fighting (as the Authorized and Revised

¹ Classing with him the other great Hellenist of the New Testament, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who uses the word *ἀθλησις*, see below. Some of the latter's metaphors seem almost to depend for intelligibility on the familiarity of the readers with Paul's metaphors from athletics. As the writer was addressing Jews, he cannot have depended on his readers' familiarity with games. He used the metaphors because they rose naturally to his mind.

² τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἡγήσασμαι· τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα· τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα, i.e. I have observed the rules which are laid down for this race-course of faith.

Versions have it); but the instructions to Timothy are, "Compete in the honourable contest of faith,"¹ a more compressed expression of the same comparison as in 2 Timothy iv. 7. The race in this honourable contest is described most fully in Philippians iii. 12-14, "It is not as if I had already got the prize or finished the race, but I am rushing on hard, to see if I may seize that for which I was actually seized by Christ; brethren, I do not count myself yet to have seized (the prize); but this one thing only, forgetting everything that lies behind, and straining forward to what is in front, I rush on with the goal in my view so as to reach the prize of the summons on high of God in Christ Jesus." The metaphor is concealed in several other cases in the English Version under the term "contention" (1 Thess. ii. 2) or "striving" (Col. iv. 12).

The prize in the foot race and other athletic contests was the crown; and the person who thinks of the Divine life as a race towards a goal must think of the culmination of the Divine life as the gaining of the victor's garland. But there are two important differences, (1) that in the games only one can obtain the prize, whereas every runner in the Divine race of life may gain it; (2) that the crown in the one case is an evanescent garland, which soon withers, whereas in the other it is permanent and unfading (1 Cor. ix. 24-27).

The analogy which Paul has in his thought is not confined to the eagerness of spirit and concentration of purpose and to the prize which is aimed at. The athletic competitor must live a life of training and strict discipline before the actual competition begins. So for the Divine race, "I keep under my body and bring it into subjection," to avoid the danger of being led away and shipwrecked by passion and self-indulgence.

¹ ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως.

The athlete must also "strive lawfully" and observe all the rules laid down by the trainers and the guardians of the course, not merely for conduct in the course, but also during the preparation for it (2 Tim. ii. 5); and similarly in the Christian life it is Faith, like the arbiter, who lays down the laws of the struggle (2 Tim. iv. 8).

It was chiefly the race-course that furnished St. Paul with his metaphors; but the boxing contest also suggested itself to his mind in one case at least. "I so box as one that does not beat the air" (with his fists: 1 Cor. ix. 26).

The metaphors of this class are confined almost exclusively to St. Paul in the whole range of the Bible, and with him they are extremely frequent. The Paulinistic author of the letter to the Hebrews is almost the only other writer who uses such figures, and with him they are only few. The author of Revelation ii. 10 is hardly an exception. "The crown of life," the reward of the victor, is in a sense the garland of victory; but the crown was suggested to his mind rather by "the crown of Smyrna" than by the garland of the games¹; and the idea of victory which so often occurs in the Seven Letters seems hardly to be consciously connected in the writer's thought with the games, but rather with war. The crown was not peculiar to the Greeks or to athletic contests; and, before assuming the connexion, in any case, it is necessary to prove that the idea of athletics lies in the passage as a whole. That is not the case in any of the non-Pauline passages where the crown is mentioned, except in Hebrews,

St. Paul stands alone in this respect; and his language came to him because of his early training. It is quite impossible to suppose that a method of illustration which is so frequent and characteristic was chosen deliberately to suit his readers in Gentile Churches. The Hellenist who

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 275.

wrote to the Hebrews used them in one or two cases in spite of the prejudice of his readers against those pagan habits. St. Paul was free from the prejudice; he found that the keenness and enthusiastic, passionate attention, which were lavished on athletic contests in the world where he had been brought up, furnished the best illustration for the Divine life and the spirit in which it must be lived. He could not have appreciated this fact unless he had been brought up amid those surroundings and had experienced the strength of those feelings. If he had been educated as the narrow, strait-laced Jews to whom such things were an abomination it is impossible to suppose that he could have used such comparisons.

The frequency of these metaphors from gymnastic sports is a striking fact. They show real understanding of the intensity of feeling that the competition rouses in the athlete. It is only in youth, and especially in boyhood, that this can be learned. A Jew brought up in Palestine to abhor such sports, conducted by Gentiles in the Greek fashion of nudity, could never come to understand this intense feeling, if he merely saw the games in later life while living as a preacher in Greek cities. Paul had been educated in a Hellenic city, where he had seen for himself that athletic sports are not wrong or abominable¹; he had understood sympathetically the feeling of the competitors; he knew that this feeling contained an element of nobleness and self-sacrifice, and he utilized it to express the intensity of the religious life. He had obviously not the slightest idea in his mind that such comparisons degraded religion.

¹ The Jews of Jerusalem had begun to learn this fact early in the second century B.C.; and the building of a gymnasium (to which the priests hastened after service in the Temple), with the spread of Greek fashions and increase of heathenish manners in Jerusalem (especially the wearing of hats by the young men), are mentioned as having provoked the Maccabaeen rebellion (2 Macc. iv. 12-14).

The narrow Jew could not free himself from that idea, but it evidently had no place in Paul's mind, which had been formed in other surroundings than those of Palestine. He sympathized with the Gentile ; he had learned from the Gentile ; he was a debtor to the Gentile.¹ Just as the experience of Ignatius in the Pagan Mysteries, and his understanding of the intense religious feeling which they roused in their votaries, coloured and formed his language in describing the deepest and most mystic elements in the Christian faith,² so Paul's language was coloured and formed by his experience in Tarsus. A man whose mind was thus moulded could not long have remained in sympathy with the Jews of Jerusalem. A common hatred for Him whom they thought an impostor united them all for a time to resist the religion of Christ. But his nature had been formed in a freer fashion than the Palestinian, and he soon burst their narrow bonds. His nature drove and goaded him on into a wider field , and he found it hard to "kick against the goads."

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Compare Rom. i. 14.

² *Letters to the Seven Churches*, ch. xiii.

*ST. PETER : CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN
HIS HISTORY AND HIS TEACHING.*

THE object of this paper is to compare what is related concerning St. Peter in the New Testament narratives with what he writes in 1 Peter.

The Simon Peter of the Gospels has more of a distinct individual character than we can associate with any other name in the New Testament. We see him eager and forward, emotional, generous, carried away by the feeling of the moment, attached to the Lord Jesus with enthusiastic and demonstrative reverence ; but liable to reaction in a pitiful degree, and therefore discredited by lapses : having more likeness to the tide in its flow and its ebb than to an immovable rock.

St. Mark's Gospel has been regarded as representing in a special manner the recollections of St. Peter. Let us therefore note first the places in St. Mark in which St. Peter's character is illustrated. It will be seen that forwardness is the most obvious feature of it. Simon was the first hearer of Jesus who was so strongly attracted by Him as to abandon his employment and his home, and to become His follower and companion. What ardour this must have required ! Simon and his brother Andrew (i. 16-18), in response to the call of Jesus, left their nets and followed Him. It is certain that Simon led his brother ; and when James and John were called, they had before them the example and the enthusiasm of their friends the sons of Jona, to make obedience the easier to them. When Jesus de-

parted before daylight into a desert place to pray (i. 35-37), Simon and they that were with him followed after Him. From the first Simon was the accepted leader of all those who were about Jesus. When the Twelve received their special appointment as apostles or envoys, St. Mark observes (iii. 16), "Simon He surnamed Peter." But we are not obliged to believe that this surname was formally given at that time to Simon, any more than that James and John were then surnamed Boanerges. There is some apparent support, it is true, for the assumption that these descriptive names were given in advance, in John i. 42, "Thou shalt be called Cephas." But it is more probable that the titles were not actually given until particular circumstances suggested them. In St. Mark's narrative of the cardinal confession made at Cæsarea Philippi, there is only the brief statement (viii. 29), "Peter answereth and saith unto Him, Thou art the Christ," without the blessing and promise that followed. But this Evangelist tells us of the correction which St. Peter presently incurred when Jesus began to warn the disciples that He, the Christ, would be rejected and put to death. "Peter took Him and began to rebuke Him." The warm-hearted follower could not admit the thought of such a future awaiting the Master in whom he believed. And Jesus was deeply moved by the sympathy thus expressed. To Him also the Passion had its dark and repellent aspect ; but He thought perhaps chiefly of what it would be to this band of trustful followers. "Turning about, and seeing His disciples, He rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan !" He was aware of a temptation dangerously assailing Him in the form of this sympathy ; and with a vehemence that sometimes marked His action and His words He repulsed the Tempter, as in the wilderness. The repugnance and the sympathy, the shrinking from the Cross, the refusal to believe that the Christ should

suffer, were very human ; but the Divine purpose of redemption overrode these touching weaknesses. The shrinking did not belong to the Divine mind, but to the natural human affections. That St. Peter's human-mindedness did not make him less dear to his Master was shown six days after, when Jesus took with Him Peter and James and John (ix. 2-6) to witness the Transfiguration. The three apostles were profoundly awed by what they saw : Peter did not know what to say, but it would not have been like him to say nothing, so he gave expression to the wondering reverence which possessed them all in the childlike words, " Master, it is good for us to be here, and let us make three tabernacles, for Thee and Moses and Elijah." Could this moment of heavenly glorification be prolonged ! A little later another casual observation of St. Peter is recorded : when Jesus had cursed the fig tree, and the disciples passing it the next morning saw that it was withered, " Peter, calling to remembrance, saith unto Him, Rabbi, behold, the fig tree which Thou cursedst is withered away ! " It is not obvious why this natural remark is preserved, or how it served to suggest what the Lord Jesus went on to say. Perhaps the sort of pride in the wonder-working power of Jesus which it expressed was not entirely to the Lord's mind. He was always seeking to lead His disciples through Himself to the Father in heaven ; and in harmony with this aim He continually endeavoured to awaken them to spiritual conceptions. " Have faith in God," He says. " Do not make much of physical wonders, or of Me as able to work them. You, if you will have faith in God, shall work greater wonders. The important thing is that your minds should be filially trustful towards God ; and that cannot be without your being also brotherly towards your fellow-men." When Jesus had prophesied the destruction of the Temple, " Peter and James and John and Andrew asked Him pri-

vately, Tell us, when shall these things be ? And what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished ? ” (xiii. 3). Peter was the one to express most frankly the dependence on signs, and the impatience, which were natural feelings of the disciples in general. They were all perplexed, and Peter was the readiest to ask for explanations. And he was the readiest to express in words the devotion which all the Apostles showed in their action up to the last too trying moment. When Jesus warned them that they would all be offended, or would stumble (xiv. 27), Peter exclaimed, “ Although all shall stumble, yet will not I.” Nay—his Master told him—before that very night was over, he would actually disown Him. But Peter “ spake exceeding vehemently, If I must die with Thee, I will not deny Thee.” Jesus knew this fervour to be genuine ; and when He went apart in Gethsemane to pray, He took with Him Peter and James and John (xiv. 33). The exhausted disciples fell asleep ; and it was to Peter that the Lord addressed His indulgent remonstrance, “ Simon, sleepest thou ? Couldst thou not watch with Me one hour ? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation : the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.” The spirit for a while kept its ascendancy. When the band sent by the Jewish authorities had laid hands on Jesus, one of the disciples (St. Mark leaves him unnamed) “ drew his sword, and smote the high priest’s servant and struck off his ear ” (xiv. 47). Peter must have known that he was throwing his life away ; but he was saved by the act of healing of which another Evangelist tells us. The spirit was still dominant enough to constrain Peter to follow afar off, even into the court of the high priest. But as the miserable hours drew on, the willingness of the spirit failed, and the weakness of the flesh increased, till what had seemed so impossible took place, and Peter

disowned his Master. But his loving reverence was quickly rekindled, and he broke into a passion of tears. St. Mark tells nothing more of what Peter did or said.

But the other Evangelists add records which further illustrate the character and history of St. Peter as given us by St. Mark. In their Gospels he is equally to the front of the disciples,—the first to be won to Jesus, the habitual spokesman of the rest, treated by Jesus as their leader, specially favoured and specially corrected and warned, entirely sincere in his devotion but strangely unstable. St. Matthew alone relates the characteristic incident, how, when the disciples saw Jesus walking on the water, Peter called to Him, “Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee upon the waters. And He said, Come. And Peter went down from the boat, and walked upon the waters, to come to Jesus. But when he saw the wind, he was afraid ; and beginning to sink, he cried out, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth His hand, and took hold of him, and saith unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt ? ” (xiv. 28–31). Again a certain eagerness is followed by an expostulation, when Peter, wanting to have things explained, asked, “Declare unto us the parable ” ; and Jesus, before giving the explanation, remonstrated, “Are ye also even yet without understanding ? ” (xv. 15, 16). The confession at Cæsarea Philippi, related briefly by St. Mark and St. Luke, is set forth most fully by St. Matthew. In his Gospel, St. Peter answers, in reply to the inquiry of Jesus, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” And thereupon Jesus spoke the significant words, “Blessed art thou, Simon Barjonah ; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock [upon this that has been revealed to thee] I will build my Church ; and the gates of

Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven " (xvi. 16-19). St. Matthew, recording with St. Mark how Jesus was tried by the unwillingness of the disciples to accept His announcement that He was to suffer and be put to death, adds an illustrative word : Jesus turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan, *thou art a stumbling-block unto me*, for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men " (xvi. 23). A stumbling-block is nearly what we should call a temptation. The shock which the future Passion gave to the disciples affected their Master so strongly that He had to suppress with vehement decision an inclination to feel with them. Again we have, in Matthew xviii. 21, an approach of Peter met with a rebuff. " Then came Peter, and said to Him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him ? Until seven times ? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times ; but until seventy times seven." Peter's question, innocent as it looks, represented that teaching of the scribes which was so offensive to our Lord, a formal, external, unspiritual way of looking at things, reducing the inner life to a business of rules and numbers. Jesus would not tolerate the notion that His disciples were to keep count of their forgivenesses ; that would be enough to make them unreal. Their forgiving was to be " from the heart." Once more, in the two Evangelists (Matthew xix. 27, Luke xviii. 28), we have St. Peter making a boast ; and both show how kindly Jesus received the expression of devotion ; whilst St. Matthew gives further the warning which the boast drew from Jesus. When Jesus had been deploring the difficulty which a rich man would find in entering into the kingdom of heaven, Peter gave expression to what was

in the minds of the disciples—that they at any rate had given up everything to follow their Master and become the first subjects of His kingdom. “Lo, we have left all, and followed Thee!” St. Matthew adds what was also so likely to be in the minds of all, “What then shall we have?” Certainly, Jesus told them, they should not be without the amplest reward. All real sacrifice, such as He knew theirs to be, should be much more than compensated. *But*, there is a danger of the sacrifice being turned into a bargain, an investment. The moment a disciple asks, What shall I have for my service? he is forfeiting the claim which God will acknowledge. God is not to be served as by labourers who work for hire, but by the real giving up of what a man has and what he is. In a very remarkable passage of St. Luke (xxii. 24–34), Jesus similarly combines promises and warnings. It would seem that, as the end drew nearer, there was more of tenderness in the Lord’s sense of the weakness of the disciples. On the last night they were contending amongst themselves, as St. Luke records, about precedence. Jesus bade them consider the example they had in Him. “But”—He recalled with an access of affectionate feeling—“ye are they which have continued with me in my trials, and I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me.” And He went on, “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat; but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not: and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren.” Peter understood that the Lord contemplated a temporary failure of his constancy; and he protested, “Lord, with Thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death.” Then followed the more definite prediction of the denial. The last mention of St. Peter in St. Luke keeps his impulsive temperament still before us (xxiv. 12). The women were telling the apostles of their finding the

tomb empty and of the apparition of angels. "These words appeared in their sight as idle talk ; and they disbelieved them. But Peter arose, and ran unto the tomb."

In the Fourth Gospel we should hardly have expected to find such illustrations as are given us there of St. Peter's character. Devotion to Jesus, unreserved and appreciative, but hasty and forward, marks all the allusions to him in St. John. The falling away of many disciples caused Jesus to ask the Twelve, "Would ye also go away ?" and it is Simon Peter who answers, "Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life : and we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God" (vi. 66-69). What can be more like St. Peter than his behaviour at the washing of the disciples' feet ? Some of them had submitted in awe to what the Lord was doing. "So He cometh to Simon Peter. He saith unto Him, Lord, dost Thou wash my feet ? Jesus answered him, What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt understand hereafter. Peter saith unto Him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. Simon Peter saith unto Him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." In the same night we see him twice intervening, impatient, wanting to know. When Jesus said, "One of you shall betray me" (xiii. 24), Simon Peter, appealing to the disciple who was reclining next to Jesus, and whom he assumed to be more in their Lord's confidence than himself and the rest, said, "Tell us who it is of whom He speaketh." Presently, when Jesus spoke of going away, Simon Peter says to Him (36), "Lord, whither goest Thou ? Jesus answered, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now ; but thou shalt follow afterwards. Peter saith unto Him, Lord, Why cannot I follow Thee even now ? I will lay down my life for Thee." And he did in a sense lay down his life for his Master, when

he drew his sword against the high priest's servant, and struck off his right ear. It is in St. John that Simon Peter is named as doing this (xviii. 10). The sad story of the denial is told with greater fulness in St. John (15-27). And again there is greater fulness in the account of the visit to the empty tomb (xx. 1-8). Simon Peter, when he set off running, was accompanied by the disciple whom Jesus loved. This disciple outran Peter, but when he came to the tomb, he stopped at the entrance, and only looked in ; but Peter coming up, went at once into the tomb, and was followed by the other disciple. The last we hear of St. Peter in the Gospels is when Jesus manifested Himself to His disciples at the sea of Tiberias. Simon Peter was still the leader whom the others followed. He said, "I go a fishing," and they went with him. When Jesus stood on the beach, it was the other disciple who was first to be sure that it was the Lord, but when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his coat about him, and cast himself into the water. The other disciples remained in the boat, dragging the net full of fishes. When they came to the beach, it was Simon Peter who drew the net to land (xxi. 2-11). Then followed after a while that profoundly interesting conversation which began with the Lord's question, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these ?" Those words "more than these" seem as if they must refer to the manner in which Peter outran his comrades in demonstrative reverence and affection. "If thy devotion surpasses that of these others,—then, feed my lambs." There are slight variations in the charge given three times. "Feed my lambs ; tend my sheep ; feed my sheep." The Lord was resolved that, at the cost of Peter being hurt by the repeated question, "Lovest thou me ?" he should never forget that he was charged to be a true and faithful shepherd. The final appeal of Jesus was, "Follow

me." Deeply moved—broken down, we may say—by his Lord's tenderness and his own sense of unworthiness, Peter's heart was drawn towards his companion whom he knew that Jesus loved ; and he asked, " Lord, and what shall this man do ? " Jesus answered, " If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ? Follow thou me." The calling of the most ardent of the disciples was to be a keeper of the sheep of Jesus and to follow his Lord.

In the founding of the Church of Christ St. Peter had the first place, first in time and foremost in importance ; until his work—that of the Apostle to the Jews—began to be eclipsed by that of the Apostle to the great Gentile world. We see him taking the lead, but with a different manner from that which we have been observing in the Gospels. In the Acts, he is the acknowledged chief of the Apostolic band, but never outrunning his comrades, always dignified and courageous, speaking and acting with authority, but waiting on instructions from his heavenly Lord ; feeding his Master's sheep, whilst he dutifully followed his Master. Critics have been ready to make the most of what signs there are in the Acts and other New Testament books of differences between St. Peter and St. Paul ; but I think there has been no attempt to make out that the Jerusalem Apostles were troubled by dissensions amongst themselves. If there was such harmony as there appears to have been in the governing body that consisted of Simon Peter and his colleagues, during those most trying days of the early history of the Church, that is surely a very remarkable fact. Where our Lord says to Simon, " Do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren," our Authorized Version has, " when thou are converted " ; and we might almost say that St. Peter seems to have undergone a change equal to that of " conversion " between the Denial and the Day of Pentecost. And if he on his part was able to avoid

everything in speech or act which could offend any of his colleagues, we must recognize that they all proved themselves to be wonderfully influenced by the uniting Spirit poured out upon the new Society. St. Paul, in Galatians ii. 11-14, records an incident which we generally understand as an exhibition of the weakness which in the Gospels follows close upon Simon's ardour. But St. Peter's action may be regarded as illustrating his earnest desire and endeavour to keep the peace between disciples of different views and habits. And if he, the chief of the Twelve, bore with patience St. Paul's unsparing championship of Gentile liberty, the harmony maintained at Jerusalem becomes the more intelligible to us.

We have the First Epistle of St. Peter to show us what were the ideas and sentiments which characterized the teaching of the Apostle in his later days. His addresses reported in the Acts were chiefly straightforward and fearless testimonies to the resurrection and the royalty of his Crucified Master. One of them, to which we shall refer again presently, contains a quotation from the Psalms, which he had heard Jesus Himself use (Matt. i. 42). This Jesus, he says, "is the stone which was set at nought of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner : and in none other is there salvation " (Acts iv. 11, 12).

Five particular indications of St. Peter having been influenced in what he wrote by what had occurred in his personal history may be observed in the Epistle. But it is worth while to note first its general tone. All through it St. Peter is commending gentleness, orderly and conciliatory behaviour, submissiveness, patience under insults and injuries. There is no sign anywhere of the old eager and impetuous Simon. It would seem that Simon had been "converted" into a new Cephas or Peter. As he recalled the image of Him who when He was reviled reviled not

again, and who had bidden him put up his sword into its sheath, suffering and patience became sacred to him ; and he felt that the main endeavour of those who would follow Jesus must be to curb resentment and to bear with meekness and to submit to regulation. He seeks to persuade the Christians to be as inoffensive neighbours and as loyal citizens as it is possible for them to be in their surroundings.

1. In the phrase "Gird yourselves with humility, or, wrap round you the apron of humility, to serve one another" (v. 5), it is obvious to see a reminiscence of the washing of the feet of the disciples, followed by the saying, "I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you" (St. John xiii. 14, 15).

2. In the Epistle, the sufferings of Christ, and the glories to follow them, are three or more times associated together in a manner which shows the connexion between them to have been at home in St. Peter's mind. We have seen that as a follower of Him whom he believed to be the Christ he had been shocked by the prospect of his Master's rejection and death, and that a few days after the first shock he was taken with the two sons of Zebedee to see a vision of Jesus in glory on the Mount of the Transfiguration. He was persuaded to reconcile himself to the sufferings of the Christ in view of the glory to follow. And he was brought, as time went on, to see this connexion in the old prophets. "The Spirit of Christ in the prophets . . . testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them" (i. 11). The share of the members in the sufferings and the glory of their Head is assumed in iv. 13 : "Inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice ; that at the revelation of His glory also ye may rejoice with exceeding joy." In the third mention of the sufferings and the glory St. Peter might almost seem to be referring directly to the Transfiguration : "The elders among you I exhort,

I the fellow-elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ and also the partaker of the glory that is about to be revealed ” (v. 1).

3. This last correspondence passes into the next. “ The God of all grace, who called you unto His eternal *glory* in Christ, after that ye have *suffered* a little while, shall Himself perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you ” (v. 10). St. Peter could certainly never forget the touching words, “ Simon, Simon, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat : but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not : and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren ” (St. Luke xxii. 31, 32). The Tempter, the adversary, proved himself peculiarly dangerous to Simon ; but if he stumbled terribly, the ardent disciple was enabled by the grace of God to recover himself ; and his Master bade him believe that his weakness might help him to be a means of strengthening to others. He would know the need of constant watchfulness against temptation, of a militant attitude against the adversary : he would be able to encourage his brethren to rely on the assured grace of God. His mind being set on preserving his brethren from such lapses as his had been, he would find ways of practically helping them to stand firm. “ Stablish thy brethren ” : that was a charge he could never forget. He knew the power of sufferings to perplex and depress those who were bidden to trust in God’s love and care. So he wrote thus :—“ Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time ; casting all your anxiety upon Him, because He is caring for you. Be sober, be watchful ; your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour : whom withstand, stedfast in your faith, knowing that the same sufferings are accomplished in your brotherhood that is in the world.” Thus he could exhort his fellow-believers ;

but he could only stablish them effectually by leading them to look to the gracious Father and to depend on Him. "The God of all grace shall Himself perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you." The multiplication of these words is significant. Our Revisers thought that the evidence was in favour of leaving out the last word ; but Professor Nestle, in the Greek text prepared by him for the Bible Society, has restored it. The Greek words are—*καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει*. The second is the word spoken by our Lord in the charge He gave to Peter. *Καταρτίσει*, would be used for the setting of a limb that was broken or out of joint—"will put you right." *Στηρίξει*, "will make you firm." *Σθενώσει*, "will make you strong, put vigour into you." *Θεμελιώσει*, "will settle you on a good foundation."

4. We have seen with what earnest insistence the Lord Jesus charged Simon Peter to be a good shepherd to the sheep of Christ. "If thou art before all others in thy devotion to me, feed my lambs, tend my sheep, feed my sheep." The lambs and sheep belonged to Christ, He was the good Shepherd who gave His life for His sheep ; but He employed shepherds under Him. The efficiency of these under-shepherds depended on their loyalty to the Divine Shepherd. Simon Peter did his best to keep His Master's sheep, as the chief Apostle to his fellow-countrymen. But where his personal superintendence could not reach, there were local shepherds or pastors, each over his flock. To them St. Peter writes, "The elders among you I exhort, who am a fellow-elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partner of the glory that shall be revealed, tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God ; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind ; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but

making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away" (v. 1-4). St. Peter and his fellow-shepherds, all who had any oversight over portions of the flock of God, had to give account to the Chief Shepherd, who owned the whole flock. The members of the Church were sheep that had gone astray, but had returned unto the Divine Shepherd and Overseer of their souls.

5. As the confession at Casarea Philippi, and the blessing which followed it, form the chief distinction in the apostolic career of St. Peter, matching the humiliation of the denial ; so the passage of the Epistle which illustrates it is the fullest of those which we are considering. It occurs in the second chapter. St. Peter has been bidding his readers long for the spiritual food which will nourish them unto salvation,—“if,” he says, “ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.” Then he abruptly passes from one figure to another : “to whom coming, a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. Because it is contained in Scripture, Behold, I lay in Zion a chief cornerstone, elect, precious ; and he that believeth on Him shall not be put to shame. For you therefore which believe is the preciousness ; but for such as disbelieve, the stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner ; and, a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence ; for they stumble at the word, being disobedient” (ii. 4-8). We have seen that in one of the earliest of his addresses after the Day of Pentecost, St. Peter said of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, “He is the stone which was set at nought of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner”

(Acts iv. 11) : and that he was applying to Christ a prophetical image which Christ had already appropriated to Himself (Matt. xxii. 42). When therefore Jesus spoke of the rock upon which He would build His Church, St. Peter must have understood Him to mean that He would build it upon Himself ; and if He called Simon a stone, St. Peter must have thought of himself as the first of the living stones joined to the Living Stone or Rock that a temple of worship and sacrifice might be built up unto God. The name of Cephas or Peter was a continual witness to Simon himself and to his fellow-believers of the purpose of God to build up a Society or Brotherhood resting upon the Christ, the Son of God and Son of man. The Christians who considered the significance of the name were reminded that they were joined to the Brotherhood as the stones of a building are added to the corner-stone or foundation, and that the whole sacred Society depended for its existence and unity and character on its Head and Saviour and Lord.

J. LLEWELYN DAVIES.

THE CRETANS ALWAYS LIARS.

EVERY student of the New Testament knows the famous hexameter verse on the Cretans in the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus (Titus i. 12), and is also aware that it is from a lost work of Epimenides, the Cretan poet. The identification is a very early one in the Christian literature ; it occurs, for example, in Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis* (i. 14), with the remark that St. Paul recognizes Epimenides the Cretan as a Greek prophet, and is not ashamed to quote him. It is found again in the Euthalian apparatus of the New Testament, where, in the list of quotations (*μαρτυρίαι*) in the Pauline writings, we find the passage from Titus, described as—

Ἐπιμενίδου Κρητὸς καὶ μάντεως χρησμός,
καὶ Καλλιμάχου Κυρηναίου ποιητοῦ ἡ αὐτή.

Here we find a reference to Epimenides as having the Mantic gift, which explains why Clement of Alexandria and the Epistle to Titus call him a prophet, rather than a poet ; and we have a further reference made to Callimachus the poet, as using the same testimony (*μαρτυρία*), who must, on this showing, have quoted from Epimenides. A MS. on Mount Athos¹ has the Euthalian note in a more extended form and tells us that the verse from Titus is found in Callimachus' *Hymn to Jove*—a fact which had already been recognized by scholars. The Athos note is as follows :—

Ἐπιμενίδου Κρητὸς μαντέως χρησμός.
κέχρηται δὲ καὶ Καλλίμαχος τῇ χρήσει
ἐν τῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ῥηθέντι εἰς τὸν Δία ὕμνῳ,

and the verification of the reference is given by turning to Callimachus, *Hymn in Jov.* 8, where we find a line beginning with

Κρηῆτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται.

¹ Cod. Laura, 184.

So far there is nothing in the identification that has not been long recognized, unless it should be the marginal reference from the Athos MS. But now let us pass on to a more obscure point, viz., the reason why Epimenides, himself a Cretan, should have expressed himself so savagely with regard to the Cretan character. He would not have denounced his fellow-countrymen unless he had been provoked, and one is tempted to say that the provocation must have been acute. He is not writing a book on national characteristics ; something must have preceded in his text which caused the rhetorical outburst. This is betrayed not only by the passion of the writer, but by the word ἀεὶ, which has here a retrospective reference to some particular lie which has fallen from Cretan lips. If, for a parallel, I were to say that "A or B *always* exaggerates," it would probably be the case that I had before me some definite case of exaggeration on the part of A or B. This case I might have treated by the method of rapid generalization (probably an unjust proceeding), and thus have replaced the incident by the character corresponding to it, or I might actually have had the generalization made in advance, and from experience, in my thought, and simply have put the particular exaggeration into the company where it belonged. What then was the incident which provoked Epimenides ? and was his extended formula just or unjust ?

The Greek scholiasts and commentators, with pedantic and pitiful biblical loyalty, went to Homer for the answer : they laid it down, as Eustathius does, in his commentary on Homer, that it was the wickedness of Idomeneus the Cretan which led to the outburst of Epimenides ; he had played false in the distribution of the spoils of Troy : hence the proverb about Cretan lying, and Cretizing, and all the rest of the proverbial railings which have come down to us. But this bit of pedantry is obviously wide of the mark :

there is not the slightest reason to suppose that Epimenides was thinking of Idomeneus or writing about him. He would not have lost his temper and talked about "beastly Cretans" on the provocation of a single obscure incident in the Trojan war. We must, therefore, reject the suggestion of Eustathius and of the scholiast upon Callimachus (one of whom is probably copying the other) and we must look for the wrath of Epimenides in another direction. We must search for a particular lie rather than for a particular Cretan. It was not the Cretan, but his lie that enraged Epimenides. And it is not difficult to unearth the falsity: it is the statement that *Zeus was buried in Crete*. That Zeus should have been born in Crete was not thought to be an impiety, but that he should have been dead and buried, that was blasphemy, blasphemy of the first water. The proof of this is manifold. For example, Lucian (*Timon*. 6) makes Timon laugh at Zeus and tell him it is time for him to bestir himself, "unless" (says he) "the Cretan myth should turn out to be really true, *which they tell of thee and thy tomb*."

Again, in his treatise on *The Liar* (*Philopseud*. 3), Lucian points out that it is no wonder that peoples and cities lie both in public and private, "since the Cretans can show the tomb of Zeus and not blush." A monumental lie, this of the Cretans, in more senses than one!

In the same way Lucan, in his *Pharsalia* (viii. 872), says that the Egyptians are just as great liars about the tomb of Magnus as Crete is over the grave of the Thunderer:

Tam mendax Magni tumulo, quam Creta Tonantis.

And now turn once more to the Hymn of Callimachus, and examine the context of the words "the Cretans are always liars"; he is discussing the relative claims of Arcadia and Crete to be the birthplace of Zeus; one of them must be wrong; which of them is telling the untruth? and he

answers, that it must be the Cretans, because they are known to be liars, in that *they have fashioned a tomb for the King immortal* :

Κρη̑τες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ᾧ ἄνα, σείω
Κρη̑τες ἐτεκτῆναντο, σὺ δ' οὐ θάνης, ἐσσι γὰρ αἰεί.

So we not only get the reason why the Cretans are liars, but we can go a step further, and say that the reason must have been in the lost text of Epimenides, and the quotation made from the Cretan poet by Callimachus is not limited to the statement that "the Cretans are always liars"; the tomb of Zeus was mentioned in the original poem : in fact, the tomb *is* the lie.

If we turn to the Greek Anthology (iii. 22), we shall find an epigram of Gaius Lentulus Getulicus, describing a tomb raised to a man who was lost at sea, something in the style of the English epitaph :

Here lies the body of Jonathan Ground,
Who was lost at sea and never found.

The epigrammatist describes how the supposed dead-and-buried Cretan lost his life. It was one Astydamas the son of Damis, the Cydonian ; the island of Pelops, ill-navigable Crete, the sunken reefs of Malea have been his ruin : long ere this he has filled the paunch of the sea-monsters. But people have set up on the shore a lying tomb. Do not be surprised at it ! where the Cretans are liars and even Jove is buried !

Τὸν ψεῦσαν δέ με τύμβον ἐπὶ χθονὶ θέντο· τί θαῦμα ;
Κρη̑τες ὅπου ψεῦσται, καὶ Διὸς ἐστι τάφος.

Here it is clear that the writer of the epigram is using either Epimenides or his imitator Callimachus : the connexion is made, not merely by the Cretan liars, but by the Cretan lie.¹ And here we see an elegiac couplet formed

¹ It has been suggested that the writer also imitates an epigram of

out of a previous hexameter couplet, in which there can be no doubt that the writer who is imitated had both the liars and the lie. Does it not look as if we should have to restore to Epimenides the statement about Zeus dead and buried ?

Probably enough has been said on this head, and it is not necessary to multiply Greek or Latin references further : the meaning of the famous hexameter has been deduced from a number of associated passages : and I see that the same suggestion was made by one of the editors of the Anthology in the following form :

“ That the Cretan lie relative to Jove’s tomb was the cause of the island’s bad name, is implied by Lucan, *Pharsalia*, viii. 872 ” ; a passage to which we drew attention above.

Le Prieur also, in his notes on Tertullian, makes a similar suggestion (*Tert. Apol.* 14 : “ In Insula Creta mortuum fuisse constat, unde Callimachus, *Hymni in Jovem*, etc.”).

I now propose to go a step or two farther, with the object of disclosing something more with regard to the lost text of Epimenides, and of throwing light upon an interesting riddle in Greek mythology.

I have in my possession a copy of a rare Nestorian commentary upon the Scriptures, known as the *Gannat Busamé*, or *Garden of Delights*. It is full of valuable extracts from Syrian fathers, of the Eastern school especially, and has incorporated a very large number of passages from Theodore of Mopsuestia, under the name of the Interpreter (the usual disguise by which the faithful Nestorians describe their great, but proscribed, teacher). The following passage,

Leonidas of Tarentum (No. 90), which also deals with the grave of a man who has become food for fishes :

κάγω μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος ἰχθύσι κύρμα,
Οἰχοῦμαι. ψευστῆς δ’ οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος.

which I believe to be from Theodore's hand (it certainly is a translation from the Greek and follows immediately on an extract from Theodore), contains a curious comment upon Acts xvii. 18.

“ ‘ In Him we live and move and have our being.’ The Cretans used to say of Zeus, that he was a prince and was ripped up by a wild boar, and he was buried : and lo ! his grave is with us. Accordingly Minos, the son of Zeus, made over him a panegyric and in it he said :

“ ‘ A grave have fashioned for thee, O holy and high One, the lying Kretans, who are all the time liars, evil beasts, idle bellies ; but thou diest not, for to eternity thou livest, and standest ; for in thee we live and move and have our being.’ ”

Here then we meet again with the famous quotation, and, curiously, not in a comment upon the Epistle to Titus, but upon the Acts of the Apostles, in a passage where Paul is admittedly quoting from Greek poets ! And it is clear that Theodore is either quoting Callimachus, or the sources of Callimachus. But, although it agrees closely with Callimachus, there are some things which point to the sources from which Callimachus has worked. The manner of Zeus' death is not given nor suggested in Callimachus ; and, as we shall see presently, it is information that is very valuable. But even if that bit of theological news be referred to some other source, what are we to make of the reference to Minos, the son of Zeus, as making a panegyric on his father ? This cannot have been arrived at from the reading of Callimachus, and it cannot be detached from the quotation.

And yet it is clear that the text agrees closely with Callimachus. For example, the word “ fashioned ” (*nega-ru*) is used of the carpenter or the worker in wood and stone ; it certainly stands for *ἐτεκτῆναντο* in Callimachus : and the statement “ thou didst not die, but livest ever and

abidest," is an almost exact translation from Callimachus. On the other hand, there are variations in order : it looks as if the Greek which underlies the Syriac was something like this :

Σοὶ γὰρ ἔτεκτῆν' αὖτο τάφον, κύδιστε, μέγιστε,
Κρήτες, αἰεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θήρια, γάστερες ἀργαί.

On this hypothesis the *Κρήτες* in the ordinary proverbial quotation belongs to a statement about the tomb in a previous line and should have a comma after it. The verb belonging to it has preceded it. We will suppose some such restoration to lie behind the quotations of Theodore and Callimachus. But now what has become of Epimenides, when Minos is introduced in this way ? I do not think there is any real difficulty. We must not get rid of Minos,³ though I think it is possible that the name Epimenides, written in Syriac, may have been confused with the words "over him Minos," and so, perhaps, have dropped out. But whatever be the exact form of the extract, we have the key to its meaning in a statement made by Diogenes Laertius (i. 112) to the effect that Minos, or rather Minos and Rhadamanthus, were the subject of a poem in 1,000 verses by Epimenides ; and this poem may very well have been the panegyric referred to. For if Epimenides wrote a long poem on Minos, the son of Zeus, this would be the very place in which to denounce the impious Cretans, and the denunciation might even have been put into the mouth of Minos himself.

Upon the whole, then, I suspect that Theodore is working direct from Epimenides, and not merely quoting Callimachus.

Now we pass on to the other point to which I referred, viz., the particular death with which Zeus was credited before his burial. It is certainly, at first sight, surprising to have an element of this kind introduced into Olympian mythology. To be ripped up by a wild boar belongs to

the Syrian cult of Adonis, and not to the Greek cult of the All-father. We are tempted to ask, at the first reading of the new legend, what place has the pig in the ritual of Zeus? We should expect him in the worship of Atys or Adonis or Aphrodite, but not in this connexion.

It is, however, a fact that the presence of the pig in the Cretan ritual of Zeus had already been suspected, and the connexion between the Cretan and Asian religions had actually been divined for us by our leading mythologists.

For example, Farnell writes as follows in his *Cults of the Greek States* (i. 36, 37) :

“The Cretan legend . . . may have little value for the history of the purely Hellenic religion of Zeus. A student of Greek history has to receive evidence from Crete with much suspicion, not for the reason that the Cretans were alway liars, but because *their cults and legends were often confused with influences from Phoenicia and Asia Minor.* . . .”

The Child-Zeus who dies, the son of Rhea, attended by the orgiastic rout of the Curetes, is probably not the Hellenic Zeus at all, but rather the Dionysos-Atys of Phrygia, the child of the earth, whose birth and death may typify the rise and fall of the year, and whose image, like that of Dionysos, was hung on a tree for sacrificial purposes.”

It is both curious and interesting to find a confirmation of these statements in the new form of the Cretan legend which we have brought to light.

Dr. Farnell had also brought out very clearly the fact that the pig was a sacred animal in the cult of the Cretan Zeus. He says :

“Stranger still is the Cretan story recorded by Athenaeus, that it was a sow that gave nourishment to the new-born god ; therefore all the Cretans consider this animal especially sacred, and will not taste of its flesh ; and the men of

Praesos perform sacred rites with the sow, making her the first offering at the sacrifice. Now the pig is nowhere else found in the ritual of Zeus, but was a sacred animal in the cult of Attis-Adonis, Cybele, and the Aphrodite of Asia Minor, her counterpart."

From this it appears that the pig was taboo in Crete, and in connexion with the original Zeus-cult of the island; two mythological explanations are given of the cult, one that the infant Zeus was suckled by a sow, the other that Zeus met his death by the tusks of a wild boar. Either of the explanations will find a place in the Asiatic cults, and the parallel with the Adonis-cult (and perhaps the same thing is true of the Attis-cult) in the new bit of mythology is extremely close. It is interesting, at this point, to recall what Frazer (*Golden Bough*, ii. 304) has explained, as regards the connexion between the god and the tabooed animal that appears in its cult.

"The worshippers of Attis abstained from eating the flesh of swine. This appears to indicate that the pig was regarded as an embodiment of Attis. And the legend that Attis was killed by a boar points in the same direction. For after the examples of the goat Dionysus and the pig Demeter it may almost be laid down as a rule that an animal which is said to have injured a god was originally the god himself." ¹

Probably enough has now been said on the mythological side: it seems clear that neither in Crete nor in Asia Minor did the pig owe its taboo to hygienic reasons. The quotation which we have been discussing is, in any case, a contribution, however slight, to the history of the early Cretan religion.

Now let us return, for a moment, to the supposed extract

¹ For further discussion of this point, see Frazer, *l.c.*, and for the death of Attis by a boar, *ibid.* p. 131.

from Theodore in the *Gannat Busamé*. If we are right in going behind Callimachus for the sources of the Cretan disrepute, and in suggesting that Epimenides is involved, we must also, I think, recognize that Theodore took the saying in the Acts of the Apostles from the same source. It will be quite clear that he has both text and commentary : the text is—

“ In Him we live and move and are ” :

the commentary is meaningless, unless the words “ In *Thee* we live and move and are ” are a part of the quotation : he would not have quoted at all, unless the quotation had illustrated the text, and the last clause of the quotation is the elucidation towards which the commentator is working ; it is not a repetition of the text ; it is the explanation, and it is the origin of the text. Consequently we have not only a reference of Paul to Aratus, in “ We are also his offspring ” (τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γενὸς ἐσμεν) but also a reference to some other Greek poet, probably to Epimenides, in the words, “ In Him we live and move and are.” Certainly he put himself into sympathy with the best and noblest side of the Hellenic faith. He was preaching a living God and not a dead one ; and he was willing to recognize that his hearers believed, to some extent, in the same God as himself.

The story of the dead and buried Zeus was a commonplace in Greek religion, a faith to some, a blasphemy to others. It is interesting to notice briefly the kind of treatment that the legend received at the hands of the early Christian apologists. It appears that they took a line of their own. They did not argue that Zeus was alive and that death could not and did not touch him. They wanted him dead, and so they pressed home the legend upon the Greeks with whom they disputed, using irony and sarcasm to the best of their ability. After all Zeus was only a man, you can see his grave, if you go to Crete. His character

is proved to be that of a mortal, and the tomb contradicts and negatives any Olympus that may be elsewhere. The king of the gods being got rid of, the lesser divinities would soon disappear. Hence the importance of good raillery ; and the Apologists railed him out of Court ; they had Lucian to help them, and probably a crowd of other reformers, and half-philosophers, who said the same things, but not so cleverly as Lucian.

Lactantius (*Div. Inst.*, col. 179) takes Cicero to task, because in his book on the *Nature of the Gods* he had distinguished three Jupiters, the third of whom was the Cretan Jupiter, whose tomb was shown there. How ! says Lactantius, can God be living here, and dead there ! have here a temple, and there a tomb ! The martyrs, too, if we may judge from their *Acta* (which at any rate are in evidence for what they ought to have said) were not slow to take advantage of the humorous side of the pagan tradition. When Achatius, for instance, was ordered to sacrifice to Jupiter, he remarked as follows : “ To the one whose tomb they show in Crete. Has he risen from the dead ? ”

While we admire the lofty protests of Epimenides and Callimachus and their allies, who attempt to purify and elevate the religious conceptions of their time, it is open to question whether the Christian apologists and martyrs were not taking the short road to a better faith by realizing that the matter had become humorous, and by treating it accordingly. And no doubt there are many superstitions in our own day that will never disappear as long as they are treated seriously. If only we could make epigrams like Tertullian or laugh with Lactantius or with Lucian !

Now that we have shown that the majority of those who called the Cretans liars were speaking from the standpoint of religion, and dealing with a particular lie, rather than with a general habit, we are almost bound to admit

that the Cretans have been judged too severely. Epimenides will have to answer for it.

If we have shown reasons for the belief that some more fragments of Epimenides can be recovered from the supposed comment of Theodore, and that a trace of the recovered lines is to be seen in the passage of the Acts of the Apostles upon which Theodore is commenting, we can now go on to clear up a difficulty which has long attached to the interpretation of St. Paul's sermon on the Unknown God: for before any suspicion had been provoked as to the existence of matters from Epimenides in the famous sermon before the Areopagus, a connexion had been suggested between Epimenides and the altar to the unknown God.

Diogenes Laertius (*Epim.* 3) tells us of a time when a pestilence raged at Athens, and in order to stay it, the Pythian oracle directed that Epimenides should be summoned from Crete to give advice on the matter. He came and turned loose a number of black and white sheep on the Areopagus: wherever they lay down an altar was erected and a sacrifice offered τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ, and this is the reason, says Diogenes, why you find at Athens βωμοὺς ἄνωνύμους, altars without names.

It was not unnatural that this passage should have been seized on to explain the mysterious Unknown God of St. Paul. But, on the other hand, Diogenes does not specify with sufficient clearness what was meant by the god that belonged or was appropriate to the place where a sheep lay down, and neither does his "nameless altar" furnish a sufficient agreement with the inscription of which Paul speaks. It is possible that these difficulties may be removed, or, at least, lightened, by the considerations at the beginning of this paper.

For if we admit that St. Paul spoke of Epimenides or from Epimenides in his discourse on the altar to the Un-

known God, then the story of Diogenes Laertius about Epimenides and the nameless altars acquires a certain confirmation. The nameless altars and the altar to the Unknown God may very well be the same thing spoken of in two different ways. The legend may actually have been known to St. Paul by popular explanation ; and in that case the reason for quoting from Epimenides would lie on the surface. He came in along with the observed altar, and when he was brought in, it was easy to raise the question of the Living God from his poems.

Perhaps this may seem to be unduly speculative. But the sermon on Mars' Hill (or to the Areopagus) is, at least, only a rapid summary, and we are obliged to speculate as to the matters that underlie the *précis* of Luke. I offer, as the ground of fresh speculation, the argument for the belief that Epimenides was quoted as well as Aratus ; and from that, as a starting point, it is quite likely that the abbreviated narrative of Luke may acquire a fresh meaning and a higher degree of vividness.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

*THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN THE EPISTLE
TO THE EPHESIANS.*

THE Epistles of the Roman captivity when compared with the earlier and later Epistles of St. Paul are seen to have several strongly marked characteristics. Not only do we find a maturity of thought and experience, but the topics also are different both in character and treatment. It is to one of these characteristic differences that we now desire to call attention by considering the teaching of the Epistle to the Ephesians on the Church.

The special interest and importance of Ephesians in regard to the Church is that apart from its companion Epistle to the Colossians it is, after St. Matthew xvi., the next and perhaps the only place in the New Testament where the Church is regarded absolutely as the one universal Church. In all other Epistles, as well as in the Acts, the term seems to be applied to a local Church and a number of local Churches, or else to the one universal Church as represented in the individual Church or local Churches. Out of the 110 places where the word occurs in the New Testament 86 are in the Epistles of St. Paul, and of these 11 only appear to refer to this idea of an universal Church ; i.e., 9 in Ephesians and 2 in Colossians (Col. i. 18, 24). This does not mean that the idea of the unity of all believers was not in the Apostle's mind and teaching before this time. As a matter of fact it is clearly traceable in earlier Epistles. The principles and duties of unity as based on fellowship with all Christians are already clear (1 Thess. ii. 14 ; 1 Cor. i. 12, 13, vi. 9), while St. Paul had also emphasized the essential oneness of Jew and Gentile in Christ (Gal. iii. 28 ; Rom. xi. 17). Thus the idea of all believers being one in Christ is evident from the first, but it is only in the Epistle

to the Ephesians that we find it receiving full expression and adequate treatment.

This extension of idea and usage to include all Christians in one great universal Church is characteristic of these two Epistles of the Roman captivity, and for several reasons it is noteworthy and very significant. The time had evidently come for the Christians to receive this fuller teaching as the complement and crown of what they already knew. It was the necessary consequence and completion of the teaching given in the earlier Epistles. Thus the Epistle to the Romans deals mainly and primarily with the relation of the individual to God in Christ. The Epistle to the Ephesians, on the other hand, starts from the corporate side of Christianity and views the individual as one of the Body. Further, Romans deals with the great problem of how Jew and Gentile were to be received respectively, and as it were separately, into fellowship with Christ. Ephesians contemplates them both as already in Christ and making one body in Him. Again, while in 1 and 2 Corinthians St. Paul emphasizes and urges unity in the local Church, in Ephesians the thought takes a wider and universal sweep as including all believers of all Churches at all times. We may perhaps also note how the Apostle, writing from Rome and possibly influenced by the imperial atmosphere, might be led to conceive of the Church of Christ as one vast organism and to emphasize the solidarity of all Christians in Him. It is also noteworthy that this conception of one universal Church was a revelation granted to the Apostle Paul only.

The full revelation respecting the Gentiles to which St. Paul refers in Ephesians iii. 6 ff. was not obviously involved from the first in the charge to preach the Gospel to all nations. It was to St. Paul himself doubtless that this prophetic illumination came in the first instance (Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 166).

The "mystery" referred to in this Epistle cannot be interpreted to mean simply that the Gentiles were to be

brought into blessing in connexion with Christ. This was clearly shown even in the old Testament (Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18) and was no "mystery" at all (Gal. iii. 8; Rom. i. 2, iii. 21). The *μυστήριον* of Ephesians is that a people should be taken out from Jews and Gentiles and should be made a joint body (*σύσσωμα*) in Christ (Eph. iii. 2, 9).

Turning to the Epistle we seem to see the Church considered in four distinct though connected aspects.

I. THE CHURCH AS A BODY.

Up to the writing of Ephesians St. Paul had used the idea of a body either simply as an illustration (Rom. xii. 3-5) or else with reference to the local Church only (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27). Now, however, he regards all Christians together as the Body of Christ. The following are the main outlines of his teaching on this subject.

1. Christ is the Head of the Body. "Head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 22f.). "The Head, even Christ" (chap. iv. 15). "Christ is the Head of the Church" (chap. v. 23). As the head to the body so is Christ to the Church. Head and body are correlative and organically connected. We are thus taught that the Church is not a fortuitous collection of individuals, but a Society with a Head, an organism and not merely two parts in juxtaposition. This connexion between Christ and the Church as illustrated by the metaphor of a Body can be variously applied. (1) There is a connexion of life. He is the source of life to the Church. Apart from Him the Body is dead, for the Church has no life in itself. (2) There is a connexion of cause and effect. The thoughts and purposes of the Head are expressed in the activities of the Body. (3) There is a connexion of power. All energy in the Body comes from the Head and through union with Him. (4) There

is a connexion of sympathy. Head and Body are in one feeling, whether of pain or joy. (5) There is a connexion of obedience. The Body responds to the orders of the Head, and what the will directs the members carry out. We may say, then, that there is a two-fold need ; that of the Head by the members, and that of the members by the Head. The members need the Head for life, sensation, and volition. The Head needs the members for expression and activity.

In some mysterious sense the Church is that without which the Christ is not complete, but with which He is or will be complete. That is to say, he looks upon the Christ as in a sense waiting for completeness, and destined in the purpose of God to find completeness in the Church (Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 42f.).

2. The Holy Spirit is the Life of the Body. The emphasis laid on the Holy Spirit in this Epistle is very clear and striking, and with the one exception of Romans viii. there is more about the Spirit of God in this short Epistle than in any other of St. Paul's writings. There are at least twelve references to His Divine grace and work in relation to the Body of Christ. From the moment of conversion He is everything to the individual Christian and to the whole Church. It is the Spirit who seals the believer as belonging to Christ (chap. i. 13, iv. 30). By the Spirit we are introduced to the Father (chap. ii. 18). We are indwelt by the Spirit (chap. ii. 22). We are taught by the Spirit (chap. iii. 5). The Spirit is the secret of inward strength (chap. iii. 16), of outward unity (chap. iv. 3), of inward sensitiveness (chap. iv. 30), and of spiritual fulness (chap. v. 18). The Word of God is described as "the sword of the Spirit" (chap. vi. 17), and prayer is to be offered "in the Spirit" (chap. vi. 18). Thus in every way, whether we think of the individual or the community, the Spirit of God actuates all.

3. Each individual Christian is a member of the Body.

Believers are viewed first in relation to the purpose of the Father (chap. i. 4-6*a*), then in relation to the work of the Son) chap. i. 6*b*-12), and lastly in relation to the grace of the Holy Spirit (chap. i. 13, 14), and thus we are members of His Body (chap. v. 30). To each and every individual member is some grace given (*ἐκάστω*, chap. iv. 7), and every one can supply something to the progress and growth of the Body: "according to the proportional energy of each single part" (chap. iv. 16). Each individual member is (1) a channel of nourishment to the rest (chap. iv. 16; cf. Col. ii. 19); (2) a means of unity as a joint and ligament harmoniously fitted and compacted, holding together the framework (chap. iv. 16); (3) a condition of growth, all acting as fitted, and so making continual increase (chap. iv. 16; cf. Col. ii. 19). Christians are therefore needed by one another for nourishment, growth, progress, fellowship, blessing, and it is a profoundly striking and deeply solemn thought that individual Christians can hinder blessing and growth from coming to the entire Body, hindering the flow of grace and keeping back spiritual power. Thus, while the Church as a whole is the Body, very clear and significant stress is laid on the importance, necessity, and due position of each single member of It. The individuality of single, though not separate, Christians could not be more clearly taught. The importance of this social and corporate aspect of the Christian life is very great and needs constant emphasis.

The believer's union to Christ, which is the deepest of all personal things, always involves something social. The call comes to him singly, but seldom solitarily (Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p. 7).

We see, therefore, the great value of the Church. It is true, that each man is saved solitarily and alone by direct contact as an individual with Christ, but it is equally true that

he is sanctified in association with others. It must be constantly borne in mind that the true, full, vigorous, mature Christian life is impossible to any Christian who tries to live a solitary life. Individual Christianity can easily be carried to extremes—and become something very different from the Christianity of the New Testament. The Christian must realize in some way “the Communion of Saints” if he is to be a true saint himself. St. Paul prayed that the Christians of Ephesus might comprehend “with all saints” the love of Christ (chap. iii. 18), each saint apprehending a little and all together comprehending that which is intended for the whole Church.

4. Jews and Gentiles go to make up the unity of the Body. It is pointed out by the Apostle that in the atoning death of Christ this oneness of Jew and Gentile was really contemplated, intended, and provided for. “He is our peace, who hath made both one” (chap. ii. 14). “That he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross” (chap. ii. 16). “Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father” (chap. ii. 18). And the fact that there was to be one Body consisting of Jews and Gentiles which, as we have seen, was the special revelation to St. Paul is stated in very definite and significant terms. The Apostle’s language in chapter iii. 3–6 is particularly noteworthy with its emphasis on *σύν* in the words “joint heirship,” “joint body,” “joint partakers.” This thought of Jew and Gentile as one Body in Christ, not as two separate bodies, but a “joint body” of which Christ is the Head, is the magnificent thought of this Epistle, and it is thence that we derive the only true ideas of unity and catholicity. The unity is that which is dealt with in chap. iv. 4–6, a seven-fold unity, of which three aspects are associated with the Holy Spirit, three with our Lord, and the concluding and culminating one with God the Father. This unity is essentially spiritual and eternal rather

than merely ecclesiastical and local. It starts with the union of the soul to Christ by the Spirit ; then as a result comes union with our fellow-believers by the same Spirit ; then follows unity of life in Christ and unity of doctrine in Christ through the Spirit. The Church is a *congregation*, and not an *aggregation*. It is a community of those who have Christ for their source and centre of life and unity. This unity is not to be confused with unanimity of opinion on every point. This is manifestly impossible. Nor is unity to be identified with uniformity of usages and forms of worship. Unity means life. Uniformity often means death. Nor is it to be limited to a unit of organization. That is an absolute impossibility, remembering differences of time, place, nations, and races in the Church. Our Lord clearly distinguishes (John x. 16, R.V.) between the unity of the fold and the unity of the flock, and clearly teaches us that the latter is essential and important, and that the former is but secondary and temporary. True unity can exist and flourish without absolute uniformity of opinion and custom, or without needing a unit of organization, because it is a unity of life, nature, teaching, and purpose in Christ.

And because the unity of the Church of Christ is a primary verity of the Christian faith, it can never be adequately represented in any outward polity, but must always be, in the first instance at least, a religious experience. Its source and centre can never be an earthly throne, but must always be that heavenly place where Jesus sits at the Right Hand of God (Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, p. 14).

The catholicity or universality of the Church necessarily arises out of this unity, and it follows that this is also spiritual. The Church as catholic means the Church as embracing all times, all places, all people, all revealed truth. It is, as the Prayer Book has it, "the whole state of Christ's Church," "the blessed company of all faithful people." It is an inclusive term, applying to all "who profess and call them-

selves Christians." The word is therefore very appropriate as testifying to the world-wide extension of the Gospel in the purpose of God. Christianity is intended for all men, and all Christians form the Catholic Church. The sole use of the term "Catholic" by any one body of Christians is obviously a contradiction in terms, and an utter impossibility. The Church Catholic is the Church Catholic, not any one Church, however large or well known. In this catholicity all differences and distinctions, whether of race or position or capacity, are non-existent, or rather are all unified and utilized by reason of the one fellowship of the saints in Christ Jesus.

It has frequently been inquired why St. Paul uses Baptism in connexion with unity in this Epistle instead of the Lord's Supper, which, from the treatment in 1 Corinthians, chap. x., might seem so suitable and beautiful as a symbol and means of unity. It may be because the Lord's Supper is the expression of an existing and recognized unity, while Faith and Baptism initiate us into that unity. This explanation, however, is not entirely satisfactory, but everything is quite clear if for "one baptism" in this passage is understood the spiritual reality rather than the outward symbol. In 1 Corinthians xii. 13 we are taught that it is "by one Spirit" that we are all baptized into one body. It is the province of the Holy Spirit to baptize individuals into union with Christ and with His spiritual Body, while baptism in water introduces us into the visible Church. At any rate the two parts of Baptism are to be distinguished and not confused or "identified." It is at least noteworthy that apart from this one aspect of unity the other six members in chap. iv. 4-6 are all purely spiritual and not ecclesiastical.

5. The diversities of gifts in the one Body. As verses 4-6 deal with unity, so verses 7-14 bring before us the diversities of gifts in the one Body. The entire passage needs careful consideration.

(a) The spiritual character of the gifts. It is to be carefully noticed that we have to do here, not with offices, but with functions. The reference is not to so many different and separate offices exercised by so many separate officials; they are functions of the Body, and in certain cases several of these functions may have been, and doubtless were, exercised by one person. That they represent functions rather than offices may be argued from the difference found in the list here as compared with that in 1 Corinthians xii. 28. These five functions are probably mentioned as examples and not as exhaustive, and also because they apply more to the Church as universal than as local. At any rate, the first three—apostles, prophets, evangelists—clearly refer to functions exercised generally throughout the whole Church; while the fourth and fifth—pastors, and teachers—which are again not to be distinguished as referring to different persons, are concerned with an office which is of a most general kind—the pastoral and teaching office. The inclusion of apostles in this list is not so much a reference to their formal office as to their membership in and functions for the whole Body (Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 157 f.).

(b) The divine source of the gifts. This is very emphatic. “He himself gave” (v. 11). All spiritual gifts come and must come, from above. No man can rightly take upon him to exercise a gift he has not received and does not possess. *Ἐδόθη* is closely associated with the reception of the gifts from the Father by the ascended Christ, and the thought may be contrasted with the *ἔθετο*, “appointed,” “set,” in 1 Corinthians xii. 28. The thought, therefore, of a divine gift is very emphatic. The *χαρίσματα* come from the free bounty (*χάρις*) of the glorified Lord.

(c) The immediate purpose of these gifts is particularly noteworthy. They are intended to serve a very definite end; “for the equipment of the saints for their work of

ministry" (πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων εἰς ἔργον διακονίας). This seems to be a truer rendering than that of the A.V. It is not that there is a three-fold co-ordinate purpose—"for . . . for . . . for"—but rather, an immediate and an ultimate purpose. Thus the work of the ministry refers to the saints as a whole and not to a class called ministers (Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 162). We see, therefore, that these spiritual gifts from God are given for the edification of the membership of the Body that "every member of the same in his vocation and ministry may truly and godly serve." This ministering to the saints in order that they in turn may realize and fulfil their duties as members of the Christian Body is an important element of New Testament teaching (see 1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 1, 12; 2 Tim. i. 18; Heb. vi. 10). The word *καταρτισμός* needs special notice. Quite literally it means "repair" or "adjustment," and (with its cognates) is used in the New Testament with the idea of bringing into a proper condition, fitting or adjusting persons or things in order that they may realize and execute their duties (Mark i. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 9; Gal. vi. 1; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10. See Lightfoot, *Notes on St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 47).

In this passage *καταρτισμός* suggests the bringing of the saints to a condition of fitness for the discharge of their functions in the Body (Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 182).

The purpose of the spiritual gifts, therefore, is the edification of all, and the phrase "work of ministry" shows that all the saints have something to do since each one has received some gift (*ἐκάστω*, v. 7).

(d) The ultimate object of these gifts. "For the building of the body of Christ" (v. 12). The Body is to grow continually, and these gifts are intended to serve this pur-

pose. The full and final realization is seen in the words of verse 13: "Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." To this ultimate object and purpose the exhortations in verses 1-3 and verses 14-16 clearly point.

II. THE CHURCH AS A BUILDING.

Side by side, with the metaphor of a Body and associated with it is the metaphor of a Building. The whole Church is regarded as a great structure, and several aspects of truth are brought before us by means of this symbol.

1. The foundation. "Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (chap. ii. 20). It seems clear that the reference in this phrase is to the New Testament and not to the Old, and concerns the two forms of spiritual ministry by which the Church was commenced and continued (Acts xi. 28, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10; Eph. iii. 5, iv. 11. See also Armitage Robinson, and Moule *in loc.*, and Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 165). In speaking of apostles and prophets as a foundation it is clear that the reference is not to any official position of authority, but simply to the order of the growth of the Church from them and their ministry (Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 167).

2. The Corner-stone. "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone" (chap. ii. 20). In 1 Corinthians iii. 11 our Lord Himself is put as the Foundation (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7; Isa. xxviii. 16). In this passage, however, He is the Corner-stone. As to the precise meaning of this phrase as compared with the idea of a foundation two ideas are prevalent. The first of these may perhaps best be given in the words of the Bishop of Durham.

On the whole we take the image to be that of a vast stone at an angle of the substructure, into which the converging sides are

imbedded, "in which" they "consist"; and the spiritual reality to be, that Jesus Christ Himself is that which gives coherence and fixity to the foundation doctrines of His Church; with the implied idea that He is the essential to the foundation, being the ultimate Foundation (1 Cor. iii. 11). Apostles and Prophets reveal and enforce a basis of truths for the rest and settlement of the saints' faith; those truths, at every point of juncture and prominence, are seen to be wholly dependent on Jesus Christ for significance, harmony and permanence (Moule, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Cambridge Bible, p. 84).

The other view is that given by the Dean of Westminster.

He is part of the House which He founds, for He is its Corner-stone. The passage in St. Paul's mind at this point is Isaiah xxviii. 16, as it was rendered by the Septuagint: "Behold, I lay for the foundations of Sion a stone costly and chosen, a precious corner-stone for the foundations thereof." And just because he will speak of Christ in the old prophet's terms as a corner-stone, he cannot here speak of Him as the whole foundation. When St. Paul speaks of Christ as the corner-stone, he uses a metaphor which appears to be wholly Oriental. The Greeks laid no stress on corner-stone. We must go to the East if we would understand at all what they mean. The corner-stones in the Temple substructures, which have been excavated by the agency of the Palestine Exploration Fund, are not, as we might perhaps have supposed, stones so shaped as to contain a right-angle, and thus by their projecting arms to bind two walls together. They are straight blocks which run up to a corner, where they are met in the angle by similar stones, the ends of which come immediately above or below them (Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 68 f.).

The difference between these two views is not really fundamental, for in either case it implies that our Lord is essential to the coherence and stability of the structure.

3. The stones of the Building. By implication individual Christians are regarded as stones, each in his own place contributing his part to the progress and completeness of the whole (chap. ii. 19 f.; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5, "living stones"). The individual aspect, however, is not the predominant, or even the prominent point in this Epistle, but the corporate and united effect of the whole.

4. The character of the Building. The Building is to be a Temple (chap. ii. 21). The *ναός* is the shrine, the actual house, answering to the Holy Place and the Most Holy, the place of the Presence of God, and the Church thus regarded as a shrine is to be the *permanent* abode of God (*κατοικίτηριον*, chap. ii. 22; *κατοικῆσαι*, chap. iii. 17).

5. The progress of the Building. Stress is laid on the gradual upbuilding of this Divine and spiritual structure. The tenses of the verbs are particularly noteworthy in this connexion. The Christians have been definitely and once for all placed on the foundation (Aorist, chap. ii. 20). They have been permanently founded (Perfect, chap. iii. 17). They are continually being built together (Present, chap. ii. 21, 22). They are being continuously fitted together harmoniously in the process of building (Present, chap. ii. 21, iv. 16). The result is that the whole Building is to be one perfect outcome of a continuous increase and growth (chap. ii. 21, iv. 12, 16).

In this connexion it is necessary to note the force of *πᾶσα οἰκοδομή* (chap. ii. 21) which Dr. Hort (*The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 164) renders with the Revised Version, "each several building," and says that "the thought of a universal spiritual temple of God is, to say the least, not definitely expressed anywhere by St. Paul." On the other hand it seems impossible to doubt that Dean Armitage Robinson gives the truer idea when he renders the passage "all the building" according to the Authorised Version.

Such a rendering then as "every building" (that is to say, "all the buildings") is out of harmony with the general thought of the passage. If the Apostle has in any way referred to parts which go to make up a whole, it has always been to two parts, and only two, viz., the Jew and the Gentile. To introduce the idea of many churches going to make up one Church is to do violence to the spirit of this whole section. The rendering "each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple" offends the most conspicuously against the Apostle's thought. For it must logically

imply that the "several buildings" grow into "several temples": and this is at once inconsistent with the single "habitation" or "dwelling-place" of God, which the Apostle mentions in the next verse (Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 70).

It is noteworthy that we have in this Epistle the blending of the two ideas of the Body and the Building (chap. ii. 21; iv. 12, 16; cf. iii. 17).

III. THE CHURCH AS A BRIDE.

This metaphor is brought before us in chapter v. with reference to the whole Church, though it had already been used in connexion with a local Church in 2 Corinthians xi. 2, and implicitly with reference to individual Christians in Romans vii. 1-4. It is urged by some authorities that as in the metaphor of the Body the Church is a part of Christ, it cannot be intended to represent the Church as His Bride, since the Bride is not a part of the Husband, but separate from Him. It is, however, more likely that we are to regard these metaphors as two aspects of the same relationship between Christ and the Church, the one a relationship of life, the other a relationship of love. This is especially probable in view of the words, "They twain shall be one flesh," and also in the light of chapter v. 32, "This is a great mystery," as though the Apostle would say, there is more in it than appears. Taking it, therefore, as a separate though connected metaphor we notice several aspects of spiritual teaching in the relationship of the Church as the Bride of Christ.

1. The thought of Union. "The mystical union betwixt Christ and His Church." This union is wrought and maintained by the Holy Spirit (chap. i. 13-ii. 18), whereby every believer and all the Church is "joined to the Lord" (*κολλῶμαι*, 1 Cor. vi. 17).

2. The thought of Love. Christ loves the Church as the husband is to love his wife, and accordingly our Lord's love

is brought before us as proved by the gift of Himself (chap. v. 25). Love in our Lord's case is no sentiment, but a sacrifice, and it does not even cease with His sacrifice of Himself ; it is maintained and continued in service. " Loving and cherishing it " (v. 29).

3. The thought of Duty. Here we see the Bride's part, that of subordination and loyalty. So is it to be with the Church in relation to Christ. The two aspects of wifely duty, submission (v. 22) and fear (v. 33), are exactly equivalent to those required of the Church in relation to her Lord.

4. The thought of the Future (v. 27). Christ's purpose in relation to the Church is that by means of His sacrifice and service on her behalf " He might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." Thus the glorious future of the Bride, the Church of Christ, is brought before us as " holy and without blemish." In like manner in Revelation, chapters xix. and xxi., we have the picture of the glorious future of the Lamb's Wife in all the eternal glory of heaven.

IV. THE CHURCH AS A BROTHERHOOD.

Here metaphor is dropped, or at least changed, and the life of the Church is depicted mainly in terms of actuality. At the same time there are the two metaphors of the Household (chap. ii. 19) and the State (chap. ii. 19). The Church is thus brought before us under what may be regarded as the figure of a great Brotherhood having relation to God and to one another.

1. The Godward attitude of this Brotherhood. This is taught under several aspects.

(a) God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and our Father in Him (chap. i. 2, 3, 17, iii. 14, 15).

(b) We are His children in Christ Jesus adopted into His family (chap. i. 5), beloved (chap. v. 1), children of light (chap. v. 8), and members of His household (chap. ii. 19).

(c) We are also citizens of a Divine commonwealth (chap. ii. 19; cf. ii. 12; Phil. iii. 20).

(d) We are also saints, that is, those who belong to God, separated for, consecrated to, and possessed by Him. The prominence given to this aspect of the Christian life in relation to God is very noteworthy (chap. i. 15, 18, iii. 8, 18, vi. 18).

(e) We are also described as faithful (chap. i. 1), which seems to blend the two ideas of trustful and trustworthy.

In these various figures, which, however, are strongly expressive of real relationships, we see something of the Church as a Brotherhood. God is our Father, and in Him all Fatherhood and paternal relationships find their source and warrant.

2. The life of this Brotherhood. This thought is brought before us in relation to the presence and work of the Holy Spirit. All Christians are led to God by Him (chap. ii. 18), He is the bond of peace between believers (chap. iv. 3, 4), and they are sealed by Him in view of the great future when redemption will be completed (chap. i. 13, iv. 30).

3. The unity of this Brotherhood. With very great fulness and definiteness we are taught the solidarity of the Christian Brotherhood in this Epistle (chap. iii. 15, iv. 3, 4). It is a unity based upon love, and the phrase "in love," which occurs six times in the Epistle, is applied four times to Christians in relation to one another. None of St. Paul's Epistles are so clear as this as to the unity of Christians as members of the family of God, and a very special feature of the Epistle is the use of the preposition *σύν* both in connexion with our relation to Christ, and also in particular with our relation to one another. In regard to Christ, we have

been quickened and raised with Him and are seated with Him (chap. ii. 5, 6). In relation to our fellow-Christians we are being fitted together (chap. ii. 21), builded together (chap. ii. 22), and compacted together (chap. iv. 16). We are fellow-citizens (chap. ii. 19). We have a joint-inheritance, we are a joint-body, and joint-partakers of the promise of Christ ($\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$, three times in chap. iii. 6). We are to comprehend the love of Christ "with all saints" (chap. iii. 18). We are not to be sharers-together of evil (chap. v. 7), or fellow-partners with the works of darkness (chap. v. 11).

4. The reciprocal duties of this Brotherhood. In the Epistle to the Ephesians it is very striking that several practical duties are emphasized in special view of our Brotherhood with fellow-Christians. This is all the more striking when we compare the companion Epistle to the Colossians, which deals with the same duties from another point of view, basing them, not on our relation to one another, but on our relation to our Lord. Thus, in Ephesians, we are to speak the truth because we are members one of another (chap. iv. 25). We are to avoid theft, and work for our living in order to share with the needy (chap. iv. 28). We are to avoid evil speech, and say that which is good for the purpose of edifying and ministering grace (chap. iv. 29). We are to avoid all bitterness and anger, and to be kind one to another, taking our Lord's forgiveness of us as our standard and example (chap. iv. 31, 32). Uncleanliness and avarice are not to be named, "as becometh saints" (chap. v. 3), and we are all to submit one to another in Christ (chap. v. 21). Prayer is to be made for all the saints (chap. vi. 18), and we are to walk in love (chap. v. 2), the Epistle closing for grace to be with all those that love our Lord in uncorruptness (chap. vi. 24).

It can readily be seen from this brief summary what a

wealth of teaching there is concerning the Church as a Family, or Brotherhood, and how important and essential are our relations to our fellow-Christians and to the whole Church in the light of the Apostolic teaching.

Reviewing the entire teaching of the Epistle with regard to the Church in this four-fold aspect as a Body, a Building, a Bride, and a Brotherhood, there are several points of immediate and practical importance which arise out of it. The consideration of the one Body of Christ and of our Lord as its Head should dominate all our thinking and action in relation to the various questions connected with the Church to-day. Some of these applications may be fittingly considered as we draw to a close.

1. We can readily see from the teaching of Ephesians that the primary idea of the Church is that of an organism rather than of an organization. "Christianity came to the world as an idea rather than as an institution" (Newman, *Development*, p. 116). If instead of "idea" we substitute the indwelling presence of the Spirit in the hearts of believers, there is no doubt of the truth of these words and their agreement with the Pauline doctrine. The Church in its true idea is a spiritual force rather than a visible institution. Such was the case as it was originally constituted on the Day of Pentecost by the indwelling of the Spirit of God, and that which we find recorded in Acts ii. of the birthday of the Church in its present form must necessarily determine its true nature in all ages.

It is, in its true being and essence, the temple of the Holy Ghost, founded and built up on the doctrine of the Apostles. . . . Its progress was in accordance with this beginning. . . . it developed itself from within outwards—not in the reverse direction. . . . Instead of passively receiving a superinduced stamp from without, the Christian society supplied its needs from within, and of itself, that is, the invisible Church preceded the visible. . . . The result is, that when we come to define the Church—when the question relates

to its essence, not to its accidents—we must adopt the old explanatory addition of the Article in the Creed, and speak of it as “the communion, or congregation of saints”; of saints not merely by profession, or external dedication (though this, of course, is included), but in reality and truth (Litton, *Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*, Second Edition, p. 360 f.).

2. This idea of the universal Church and its gifts as primarily spiritual should therefore dominate all our views of the local and ecclesiastical Church and ministry.

All other meanings of the word “Church” are derived and modified from this, but this must not be modified by them (Moule on Ephesians i. 22).

When we take up this standpoint and judge everything by this standard, we can see how truly sad, really small, and practically futile are many of the controversies about Catholicity, Ministry, and Priesthood and how dangerous to the true ideas of Church and ministry some of the developments in Church history have been.

3. It follows from the foregoing that the reference to “the visible Church” in Article XIX. of the Church of England is not otiose, but expresses a truth arising out of the Epistle to the Ephesians, a truth, moreover, which is supported by the Prayer Book, and especially by the Creeds. These two words, “visible” and “invisible,” represent the Church in two aspects, according as it is viewed inwardly or outwardly, according to spiritual nature or according to earthly organization. The Church is visible as to those who compose it, but invisible as to its Divine Head and the spirit of its life. The two aspects are necessarily connected, but they do not cover exactly the same ground. A man may belong to the Church as visible without belonging to the Church as invisible. He may be united to the outward society of Christians without being spiritually united to Christ. But it is also true, according to the New Testament, that a man will not belong to the Church as invisible without

belonging to the visible Church. A man in Christ will join himself to other Christians. Christians living and working alone, apart from brethren, are quite unknown to the New Testament. As there depicted they are all united in fellowship and included in the Church of Christ, "the blessed company of all faithful people." A purely individualistic Christian life is an utter impossibility.

It is for this reason that we use the words "I believe" when we repeat the Creed about the Holy Catholic Church. We say "I believe," not "I see," for the essence of the Church is a matter of faith, not of sight, and lies in its invisibility to the outward eye and its visibility to the eye of faith.

For lack of diligent observing the difference between the Church of God mystical and visible, the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed (Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, B. iii. 9).

4. Not less important in this connexion is the consideration of the relation of the one universal Church to the various local Churches, and, as Dr. Hort points out, it is certainly very striking and significant that the units which compose this one universal Church are not Churches but individuals.

The One Ecclesia includes all members of all partial Ecclesiae; but its relations to them are all direct, not mediate. It is true that, as we have seen, St. Paul anxiously promoted friendly intercourse and sympathy between the scattered Ecclesiae; but the unity of the universal Ecclesia as he contemplated it does not belong to this region: it is a truth of theology and of religion, not a fact of what we call Ecclesiastical politics (Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 168; cf. Hort's *Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians*, p. 130 f.).

A consideration of this simple fact will always be a safeguard against the erroneous, because inadequate, view that, the one universal Church, which is the Body of Christ, is necessarily limited to and only coterminous with the sum total of local visible Churches.

That Church of Christ, which we properly term His body mystical, can be but one ; neither can that one be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth (albeit, their natural persons be visible) we do not discern under this property, whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body. Only our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend that such a real body there is, a body collective, because it containeth a huge multitude ; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense. Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love and the saving mercy which God showeth towards His Church, the only proper subject thereof is this Church. Concerning this flock it is that our Lord and Saviour hath promised, " I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish " (John x. 28). They who are of this society have such marks and notes of distinction from all others as are not object unto our sense ; only unto God, who seeth their hearts and understandeth all their secret cogitations, unto Him they are clear and manifest (Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, B. iii.).

5. Last of all, the Epistle to the Ephesians in two notable passages bids us look forward to the future of this great Church in relation to the universe. While the Church is to be presented pure and spotless to her Lord in the Great Day (chap. v. 27), the presentation is with a view to yet further service for Him. Even now in the present age God's glory is manifested in the Church, and this glory is to be continued " unto all the generations of the age of the ages " (chap. iii. 21, Greek), and we are further told that during the present dispensation ($\nu\hat{\nu}$) there is being made known to the " principalities and powers in the heavenlies by means of the Church the ' many coloured ' wisdom of God " (chap. iii. 10).

This is the Church in which the Holy Spirit dwells as the present, continuous, and permanent life, the Church to which all the promises of God are made, the Church outside which no one can ever be saved, the Church from which no believer can ever be excommunicated, the Church against which the gates of Hades shall never pre-

vail, the Church in which God's presence is continually realized and manifested, the Church through which His grace and glory will be displayed to the spiritual universe throughout the ages of eternity.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.*¹XLVI. THE TRIAL BEFORE THE SANHEDRIM, XIV. 53,
55-64.

JESUS was led back to the city and taken to the palace of the High Priest. Meanwhile His judges were assembling; time pressed; a popular rising in His favour might be imminent, and the sooner He was disposed of the better. With this added anxiety at a critical season, the Sanhedrim, the supreme council of the Jews, would be ready to meet at short notice; and a meeting would be summoned as soon as the arrangements had been made for the arrest.

The question now arose as to the charge to be brought against the prisoner, and the evidence by which it would be sustained. At first sight everything seemed straightforward. In official circles it was notorious that Jesus was in the habit of breaking the Law, and of inciting others to follow His example. He was a disturber of public order, a usurper of authority, and an impious impostor who claimed to be the Messiah. No doubt much else to His discredit was implicitly believed by the priests and scribes and their followers.

Obviously, however, many of these charges could not be supported by honest evidence. Even as to the Messiahship. Jesus had made no formal public claim. His work had been chiefly in Galilee, and it was difficult at a moment's notice to obtain testimony as to the obnoxious teaching of Jesus. The priests desired to justify a sentence of death; it would not be sufficient to prove some trivial offence.

Abundance of evidence was offered—witnesses are easily

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical or dogmatic account of Christ; they simply attempt to state the impression which the Second Gospel would make upon a reader who had no other sources of information as to Jesus, and was unacquainted with Christian doctrine,

obtained by the authorities of an Oriental State ; but there was not time to train the witnesses in a consistent story. At last it seemed as if a charge of intending to destroy the Temple could be substantiated, and everything appeared to be arranged satisfactorily. The court was formally opened, and Jesus was charged with this heinous crime. After the necessary preliminaries the witnesses alleged :

“ We heard Him saying, ‘ I will destroy this temple made with hands, and in three days I will build another not made with hands.’ ”

But somehow even this testimony broke down when it was produced in open court. The Sanhedrim was a large body, some seventy members, and amongst them there may have been sympathizers with Jesus. At any rate there would be upright men present, anxious to do justice, and shrewd enough to discern and expose flimsy evidence. Something fairly plausible must be adduced if it were in any way possible. So far nothing had been found ; and the authorities felt that there was danger lest a notorious criminal should escape for want of formal proof. But could not this be extracted from the prisoner Himself ? Ancient courts did not hesitate to extort confessions by torture, but this practice does not seem to have obtained in any purely Jewish court,¹ but moral suasion would be legitimate.

Till now nothing has been said of the bearing of Jesus or of any words of His since His arrest. He had soon seen that He need not fear secret assassination ; He would be accorded public trial and execution ; and men would know that He had sealed His testimony with His blood. Now He was called upon to plead before the supreme tribunal of His people. Whatever formal authority was left to the Jews was concentrated in the Sanhedrim ; the

¹ Torture, however, was used by the Herods.

official sanctity and dignity of the High Priest and his most distinguished colleagues ; the learning of the scribes ; and the pious zeal of the Pharisees. They, if any one, had the right to speak for Israel. He had brought His claims to the final court of appeal.

But as He had long foreseen, He had only brought them there to be contemptuously rejected. As He looked round at His judges He knew that His condemnation was a foregone conclusion. He might find sympathy in a minority, but no support earnest enough to secure an acquittal. Indeed, in all probability those who were most friendly to Him were least disposed to take Him seriously. His enemies regarded Him with some trepidation ; their hatred was in proportion to their fear. He had the reputation of a wonder-worker ; the Pharisees themselves had declared that He cast out devils by the help of the arch-fiend Beelzebub ; no one knew what supernatural power He might possess ; He might blast the Sanhedrim and the Temple, or even the whole city by evil magic. His sympathizers, on the other hand, may have regarded Him as an innocent fanatic, whom they would have been glad to spare, though they were not prepared to sacrifice themselves on His behalf.

Jesus had an impossible cause to maintain as far as that or indeed any earthly tribunal was concerned. Whether His teaching had been a danger to public order ; whether it could be reconciled to the Law—as to such matters He was comparatively indifferent. Nor was He anxious about His personal fate, there was no longer any uncertainty about that. Nor did He greatly care about the judgment of the Sanhedrim on His character and work. But it was necessary that the faith of His followers should survive the condemnation and execution of their Master ; that they should continue so to believe in Him as to be able to kindle

a like faith in others, and thus bring in the Kingdom of God. His Divine commission and His unique status as God's representative among men, His Messiahship, these were essential elements of His message. He knew that He could not win recognition from the men who sat to judge Him ; but could He so bear Himself in His last hours that He might still be the Christ, the Son of God, to Peter and his companions ? He was weary in mind and body through the continued strain of the previous week, and through the sleeplessness of the night that was now giving place to day ; through the alternate depression and exaltation of His wrestling with God in Gethsemane ; and through the inevitable reaction when the blow had at last fallen. For the moment, at any rate, there was nothing to be done or suffered. In His weariness a strange peace fell upon Him. He stood silent amidst the formal bustle of the court, and the noisy outcry of accusers and hostile witnesses. He made no reply, but let opportunities for protest pass unheeded, and challenges to speak go unanswered. But now the High Priest, the President of the Court, rose from his seat, and addressed the prisoner :

“ Why dost thou make no answer ? What hast thou to say in reply to this evidence against thee ? ”

The words seemed to fall upon deaf ears ; Jesus might have been wrapped in fellowship with beings of another world—God and the angels, Beelzebub and demons, according to the sympathies or antipathies of the spectators. Again the High Priest addressed Him :

“ Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed ? ”

At last Jesus was roused and turned to answer, and men leaned forward to catch His words. Hitherto He had never expressly claimed to be the Messiah, though He had accepted Messianic titles from others ; even now if He avowed Himself Messiah, it would not be a spontaneous

utterance. He had sought that recognition should come without His asking ; not because of His claims, but through the influence of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men. Now He must either claim the title for Himself, or deny His mission. On the other hand both Jesus and the whole assembly that was waiting for His answer knew that His only chance of escape lay in His disavowing Messiahship. Then perhaps He might be dismissed as discredited and harmless. Would He purchase His life at such a price ? The High Priest had asked, "Art thou the Christ," and now He answered plainly.

"I am. Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power¹ and coming with the clouds of heaven."

The assembly listened, some indignant, some with contemptuous pity, almost all incredulous. Those who feared some terrible exertion of the magic gifts of Jesus were relieved to learn that the manifestation of His power was deferred to a future time. The authorities were gratified because they had obtained from His own mouth the evidence which they needed. The High Priest rent his garments in official horror.

"What further need," said he, "is there of witnesses ? You have heard His blasphemy. What is your judgment ?"

No one proposed to investigate the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah ; it seemed as mad as if some one nowadays were to declare himself Christ appearing again at the Second Coming. "They all condemned Him as guilty on a capital charge"—a general statement that does not exclude the possibility of silence on the part of some members of the court.

The verdict and the trial over, the councillors went their way to prepare for the observances of the sacred season, some congratulating themselves on having done good service

¹ Used as a Divine Name.

by helping to expose and suppress a dangerous impostor ; others relieved that a disagreeable task was over ; some dismissing the whole affair from their minds as mere routine, throwing all responsibility on the officials, and turning to discuss indifferent matters. Perhaps there were a few who sympathized with Jesus ; they had not ventured on any open protest, but they cherished vague hopes of saving Him before the execution could be carried out.

XLVII. PETER'S DENIAL, XIV. 54, 66-72.

Meanwhile Jesus had not been entirely forsaken by His disciples. After the first panic Peter had recovered his self-possession. When he had gone some little way, and found he had made his escape for the time being, he was relieved of the sense of immediate danger, and plucked up courage to turn back and follow at a safe distance. When the company had gone in to the High Priest's palace, Peter mingled with the bystanders, and finding himself unnoticed made his way in, and sat and warmed himself at a fire amongst the followers of the High Priest. Perhaps Jesus had not yet been brought before the court, and was awaiting His trial somewhere else. Peter, however, would choose a place where he might have some view of Jesus and His judges, or at any rate hear how matters were going on, without making himself conspicuous.

But soon a woman of the priestly household joined the circle by the fire ; her fellow-servants were well known to her, and she noticed that there was a stranger among them, and took a good look at him. She had seen Jesus and His disciples in the Temple or watched them passing through the city. Peter's dress and air suggested the Galilean, and reminded her of the men she had seen with Jesus.

"You, too," said she, "were with that Nazarene Jesus." Probably in the comfortable warmth of the fire Peter was

half asleep again ; and only partially awoke to become conscious that he was the object of dangerous attention, because he was suspected of being an adherent of Jesus.

"I don't know," he faltered out, "I don't understand what you mean."

St. Mark calls it a denial, and doubtless Peter thought of it in after times as a denial, but it reads like a confused prevarication that would deceive no one. However, he was not interfered with, but he withdrew into the forecourt, where he would be less likely to attract attention. As he went he heard the cock crow.

But even here he was not left in peace ; the woman who had noticed him before seems to have been coming and going on various errands about the palace, and as she passed through the forecourt, she again caught sight of Peter. She had no doubt now as to Peter's connexion with Jesus. "This is one of them," she cried for the benefit of all and sundry, and Peter again denied his Master.

Something distracted the attention of the crowd for the moment, but after a while men began to look at him again, and recall his words and his accent, and compare notes, Then they turned upon him :

"It is quite true ; you *are* one of them, for you are a Galilean."

Peter, divided between fear and anger, broke out into the loud volubility of the excited Oriental, and declared with oaths and curses :

"I have nothing to do with the man you are talking about."

Just then the cock crowed for the second time, and the shrill, insistent noise checked Peter in his torrent of words, brought him to himself, and he remembered how Jesus had said that before the second cockcrowing he would thrice deny Him. Peter's impetuous nature, excited and over-

wrought, passed readily from cursing to weeping, and he burst into tears. We are not told the sequel, but the silence of St. Mark as to Peter's subsequent doings suggests that he fled from the scene of his fall and left Jerusalem.¹

W. H. BENNETT.

¹ In the final clause of xiv. 72, *καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν*, R.V., "And when he thought thereon, he wept," R.V. mg., "And he began to weep," the *ἐπιβαλὼν* is unintelligible in its present context. It may be an unidiomatic rendering of some Aramaic phrase meaning, "He wept bitterly," cf. A.V. mg. "He wept abundantly."

*THE JEWISH CONSTITUTION FROM THE
MACCABEES TO THE END.*

IN the preceding paper of this series,¹ upon the Jewish constitution from Nehemiah to the Maccabees, we saw that out of the priesthood and those elders of Israel whom the Priestly Law appoints as councillors of the High Priest and his colleagues in the people's dealings with other states, and whom it dignifies with the name *Nesi'im* or *Princes*, there had probably developed, by the close of the third century B.C., and under the influence of Greek models, a definite *Gerousia*, *Boulē*, or Senate, which was associated with the High Priest in his government of the nation. In the next period of the constitutional history of Israel, which we are to traverse in this paper, and which starts from the Seleucid subjection of Palestine in 197 B.C., the first facts to be appreciated are that whatever institutions the Jews hitherto had were broken up by the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164) and subsequent events; and that a fresh system of national authority had to be organized from the foundation by Judas Maccabæus and his brothers. These are facts not sufficiently emphasized by the historians, who, are too prone to assume the continuity of the Jewish constitution from the time of Nehemiah to that of Christ.

Under the Ptolemies the high priesthood had been hereditary in the Aaronite family of the Oniadæ, and so continued under the Syrian King Seleucus IV. (185-175); the High Priest being that Onias, son of Simon, whose eulogy is given in Ecclesiasticus.² Even when Antiochus IV., soon after his accession in 175, deposed Onias, it was a

¹ EXPOSITOR for September, 193-209.

² Above, p. 203.

brother of the latter, Jeshua (Jesus) or Jason, who succeeded. But the means which he employed to oust his brother, outbidding him in the amount of tribute he promised, and undertaking to introduce Greek fashions among his people, prepared the way for his own downfall, and was the beginning of all his people's troubles. Another family—the Tobiadæ—had in the meantime, by the management of the royal taxes, risen to great influence in Jerusalem. Jason sent an adherent of theirs, Menelaus, with the annual tribute to Antiochus ; and Menelaus, who, according to one account, was not even of the tribe of Levi—though this is hardly credible—seized the opportunity to get the high priesthood for himself, outbidding Jason by 300 talents of silver.¹ The struggles between Jason and Menelaus, each of whom had his own faction in Jerusalem, while both of them must have disgusted the pious Jews by their Hellenizing and the body of the people by their tyranny, led to the interference of Antiochus, who in 168 shattered the whole system of which, by these irreligious and illegitimate means, they sought the presidency. Till this catastrophe the Gerousia or Senate continued to exist, protesting on one occasion against the conduct of Menelaus.²

The Temple was desecrated, Jerusalem organized as a Greek town, and the worship of Hellenic deities enforced throughout Judæa. Numbers of Jews had already volunteered apostasy,³ and others now succumbed to the persecution. But those who remained faithful to the Law, and pursued righteousness and judgment,⁴ fled to the mountains

¹ There are two divergent accounts: 2 Macc. iii., iv., according to which Menelaus was the son of Simon a Benjamite (iii. 4, iv. 23) ; and Josephus, xii. *Ant.* v. 1, according to which he is a younger brother of Jason. But Josephus at least allows that the support of the Tobiadæ was given to Menelaus. Many take Menelaus to have been a Tobiad, but this is nowhere stated, and the opposite is a natural inference from the words of Josephus: cf. Schürer, *Gesch.*, 3rd ed. 195, n. 28.

² 2 Macc. iv. 44. ³ 2 Macc. iv. 12 ff. ⁴ 1 Macc. ii. 29,

and the desert. In the wilderness the constitution of Israel, without City, Temple or High Priest, formed itself anew from those primal elements—the consciences of a scattered people faithful to their God—out of which it had been originally created. The description of the process takes us back not only to the days of Nehemiah and Ezra, for then they had a City, a Temple and a High Priest, but rather to the times of Gideon and Deborah; with this great difference, however, that there was now a fixed and written Law. The remnant which went down into the wilderness were a number of the ordinary families of the people; men, *their sons, wives and cattle* as they are described.¹ Those who fled to the mountains were doubtless of the same class. There does not appear to have been among them a single member of the hitherto ruling classes: either chief priests or lay nobles. At first their zeal for the Law would not allow them even to fight for their lives on the Sabbath, and a large number were slain unresisting. But a family of priests, of the order of Jehoiarib, Mattathias and his five sons—John, Simon, Judas, Eleazar and Jonathan—had signalized themselves by starting, at their own village of Modein in the Shephelah, an active revolt against the officers of Antiochus, and by advocating armed resistance, even though it should involve disregard of the Sabbath. Mattathias was accepted as leader, and mustered an army. He was joined by a more or less organized group, men of position in Israel, zealots for the Law, calling themselves Hasîdhim—that is, *pious* or *devoted*.² All this happened in 167.³ In the following year Mattathias died, exhorting his followers to endure to the death in their faithfulness to the

¹ 1 Macc. ii. 30.

² The term is difficult to translate by one English word, for the noun from which it comes signifies not only love, in this case, towards God, but fidelity also to the covenant with Him.

³ ii. 1–30.

Law, and advising them to take Simon for their counsellor and Judas for their captain.¹ The simple words of First Maccabees emphasize how Israel had been resolved into its elements. The nation and temple were *in ruin*; but *the congregation was gathered together for battle and for prayer*.²

They had with them, too, the Law with its prescribed institutions and its examples and precedents from the heroic age of their national history. At Mizpeh, a *place of prayer aforetime for Israel*, Judas arranged a pathetic ghost of the legal Temple service and effected a closer organization of his forces, also with scrupulous respect to the directions of the Torah.³ After a solemn fast and reading of the Book of the Law, they gathered, as if in sacramental remembrance of their immediate duty, the ineffectual remnants of the Temple service: priests' garments, firstfruits, tithes and such Nazirites as had accomplished their days.⁴ After this, Judas appointed *leaders of the people*, later on called *scribes of the people*,⁵ which is but the Greek translation of the ancient *shôtêrê ha'am*, the captains or tribunes of the nation when it was mobilized for war: officers of *thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens*. By 165 B.C. the army amounted, we are told, to 10,000 men.⁶ In the restoration of the Temple and the renewal of the services the same year, nothing is said of the rank of the priests employed:

¹ ii. 49-70.

² iii. 43 f.: 'Ἀναστῆσωμεν τὴν καθαίρεσιν τοῦ λαοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγίων· καὶ ἠθροίσθησαν ἡ συναγωγὴ τοῦ εἶναι ἐτόλμους εἰς πόλεμον καὶ τοῦ προσεύξασθαι, κ.τ.λ.

³ iii. 46-56.

⁴ Verse 49 reads ἤγειραν, which modern versions render by the senseless *stirred up*, as if from ἐγείρω. Wellhausen ingeniously emends to ἔκειραν, *shaved or shorn the hair*, but with a very necessary query after it in view of verse 50, which goes on to say that the people then asked God in despair what they should do with the Nazirites. The proper reading, of course, is ἤγειραν, but as the aorist of ἀγείρω, frequent in Greek for the mustering of men.

⁵ V. 42: γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ נְשׂוּטְרֵי הָעָם

⁶ iv. 29.

only that they were selected as being blameless and well-wishers to the Law.¹ The legislative authority is described as *Judas, his brethren, and the whole Ecclesia of Israel*²; and, again, it is said that *a great Ecclesia was assembled to consult* as to what should be done for the Jews in Gilead and Galilee.³

We need not linger over the appearance in 161 of the High Priest Alcimus or Eliakim, of the seed of Aaron, but not of the family of Onias, nor upon his leadership of the Hellenizing faction, his institution to the office by Demetrius, his acceptance by the Hasîdhim, or the struggles between him and Judas, who rightly never trusted him.⁴ They both passed away about 159 B.C., within a short time of each other. Two points, however, are worthy of emphasis. The high priesthood was now vacant, and for seven years remained so.⁵ Moreover, the Seleucids saw that it was impossible to extirpate the Jewish religion, and gave to the Jews permission to practise this in the Temple and elsewhere, upon which the Hasîdhim withdrew from the active revolt. Henceforth this was carried on as a political movement: hardly, as Wellhausen judges, for the mere sovereignty of the Maccabean house, but rather for the independence of the Jewish nation.

Jonathan took the leadership in place of his brother, and, after several campaigns, ruled Israel in peace from Michmash for three or four years (156–152).⁶ In 153 King Alexander Balas, outbidding Demetrius for the support of

¹ iv. 42. ² iv. 59. ³ v. 16.

⁴ 1 Macc. vii. 5ff.; Jos. xx. *Ant.* x. 3; cf. xii. *Ant.* ix. 7 and 2 Macc. xiv., from which we learn that he had already acted as High Priest.

⁵ The death of Alcimus was after that of Judas according to 1 Macc. iv. 54; but before that of Judas according to Josephus, who adds that Judas was made by the people High Priest in his stead, and then contradicts this by affirming that after Alcimus the office was vacant seven years, and then filled by Jonathan.

⁶ 1 Macc. ix. 23–73.

Jonathan, appointed the latter High Priest, with a purple robe and crown of gold, and at the feast of Tabernacles, in that year, Jonathan put on the holy apparel.¹ In 150 he was further empowered to act as *military and civil governor of the province* of Judæa.² Thus the high priesthood, which had already passed from the house of Onias, came to another family, whose representatives, by their religious energy and valour, had won an indubitable right to it, and who secured, in addition, military and civil titles not before granted to any high priest by any of Israel's sovereigns. In 146-145 the Jewish territory was enlarged, and for the payment of 100 talents was relieved of the king's tithes, tolls and other taxes.³ Jonathan removed his residence to Jerusalem, and in counsel with the elders of the people strengthened the walls.⁴

On his succession to Jonathan in 143-142, Simon was confirmed in the high priesthood and the freedom from taxes by Demetrius II. ; and the Jews began to date their contracts and other documents, *In the first year of Simon, the great High Priest, Captain and Governor of the Jews*.⁵ For the last of these titles the more definite *Ethnarch* is also given,⁶ while the formal proclamation of his people's gratitude invests Simon with (so far as they are concerned) absolute power and dignity.⁷ In all but name he was king of the Jews. But the authority which conferred his power is called *a great congregation of priests and people, and of rulers of the nation and elders of the country*.⁸ If the definite *Gerousia* or Senate had been reconstituted, the name was probably purposely avoided, and the more ancient designa-

¹ 1 Macc. x. 18 ff.

² καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ μεριδάρχην : 65.

³ xi. 28-37. ⁴ x. 10, xii. 36.

⁵ xiii. 42. ⁶ xiv. 47, xv. 2. ⁷ xiv. 27-47.

⁸ Ἐπὶ συναγωγῆς μεγάλης τῶν ἱερέων καὶ λαοῦ καὶ ἄρχόντων ἔθνοὺς καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῆς χώρας : xiv. 28.

tions substituted. A difficulty remains with regard to the mention of a *Gerousia of the nation* in the superscription of the letter to the Spartans, under Jonathan, about 144 B.C.¹ But this is the only use of the title in First Maccabees, and may be due to the fact that the letter, if genuine, was addressed to foreigners and Greeks. In the same chapter the same body is called *the elders of the people*,² and elsewhere in the Book, *the elders and nation of the Jews*,³ and *the high priest, elders, priests and residue of the people*.⁴ These ancient terms are in harmony with the Maccabean spirit, democratic and tenacious of old forms.

Under the dynasty which Simon founded, the Hasmonean princes, the constitutional facts which are of interest are the following: *First*, the prince's title, which under John Hyrcanus (135-104) and Aristobulus I. (104-103) was *High Priest* and *Ethnarch*, became with Alexander Jannæus (103-76) *King*,⁵ a gradation natural in the growing weakness of the Seleucid power. *Second*, while the dead hand of Hyrcanus failed to accomplish the experiment he designed of leaving the whole of the government to his wife, while his son was to be content with the high priesthood; Alexandra, the widow of Jannæus, reigned as queen with tolerable success for nine years (76-67), the first woman who had filled the Jewish throne since Athaliah. *Third*, there is no mention of the *Gerousia* or Senate by name,⁶ and Josephus hardly notices "the leading men" or "elders" of Jerusalem.⁷ The active forces under the prince are the nation,

¹ 1 Macc. xii. 6.

² Verse 35.

³ xiii. 36.

⁴ xiv. 20.

⁵ Aristobulus had already used the title, but not upon his coins.

⁶ On some of the coins the legend runs, "High Priest and Heber of the Jews," or "High Priest Head of the Heber of the Jews." "Heber" has been taken by some to mean the *Gerousia*, by others, the whole people. But recently Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy has suggested that it is the equivalent of the Greek τὸ κοινόν in its meaning of the State as a whole, Lat. Res-publica.

⁷ xiii. Ant. xv. 5, xvi. 5.

the nobles and the now definite parties of the Sadducees and Pharisees, the former representing the aristocratic interest, the latter the popular temper, which divided the people between them.

The conflict between the sons of Alexandra, Aristobulus II. and Hyrcanus II., is of great constitutional interest : both in the adoption of the cause of the weaker Hyrcanus by Antipater, the ambitious governor of Idumæa, aided by many of the nobles ; and in the appearance before Pompey, when he entered as judge into the quarrel, not only of the two claimants to the throne, but “of the nation against them both, which did not desire to be ruled by kings, for that which had been handed down to them from their fathers was that they should obey the priests of the God whom they worshipped ; but these two, though the descendants of priests, sought to transfer the nation to another form of government so that it might become enslaved.”¹

After Pompey took the city, the Romans, who in other towns dealt with the magistrates, senate and people,² delivered, along with authority to rule the Jewish nation in their own affairs, all power in Jerusalem, such as the charge of the Temple and the repair of the walls, to the hereditary High Priest Hyrcanus II., who is also styled Ethnarch.³ But they instituted, also, or re-instituted, a Council or Senate with powers of life and death. That only now, after Pompey’s and Cæsar’s rearrangement of affairs, we meet for the first time with the word Synedrion or Sanhedrin as the name for the supreme Jewish court, is very significant. Josephus so styles the latter when he recounts the young Herod’s narrow escape from its sentence

¹ Josephus, xiv. *Ant.* iii. 2.

² E.g. Sidon, xiv. *Ant.* x. 2.

³ xiv. *Ant.* v. 2, 4, viii. 5, ix. 2, x. 2, 5. These powers were conferred by Pompey in 64, withdrawn by Gabinius, and restored by Cæsar in 47.

of death in 47 or 46.¹ The name Synedria, as well as Synodoi, had already been given to the five districts, fiscal or judicial, into which Gabinus had divided the Jewish territory.²

In 40 the Parthians, having taken Jerusalem, deposed Hyrcanus and appointed as king the son of Aristobulus II., Mattathiah or Antigonus, who called himself on his coins High Priest and King (40-37). Herod, who had been appointed Tetrarch by Mark Antony,³ and in 40 king by the Roman Senate,⁴ took Jerusalem in 37, with the assistance of Sosius, from Antigonus, who was executed.⁵ From Herod's accession to power till his death (B.C. 4), and, indeed, up to the deposition of his son Archelaus (6 A.D.), it ceases to be possible to talk of constitutional government in Jerusalem. Herod ruled by force, tempered by arbitrary pretences of justice,⁶ by flattery of the mob,⁷ by the catholic gifts of a theatre, a circus and a new temple,⁸ and by a general though inconstant respect to the prejudice of the citizens against statues.⁹ His new towers and his palace dominated the city from its highest quarter¹⁰; his soldiers in the castle commanded the courts and colonnades of the Temple.¹¹ He forbade public meetings, spread abroad his spies, skulked himself in disguise among the people,¹² and made his guards torture and execute suspects in sight of their fellow citizens.¹³ The High Priests were his puppets,

¹ Id. ix. 5. ² Id. v. 4; i. *B.J.* viii. 5.

³ xiv. *Ant.* xiii. 1; i. *B.J.* xii. 5.

⁴ xiv. *Ant.* xiv. 4 f.; i. *B.J.* xiv. 4.

⁵ xiv. *Ant.* xvi. 1 ff.; i. *B.J.* xvii. 9; xviii. 1-3.

⁶ xv. *Ant.* vi. 2, vii. 4, xvii. *Ant.* v.

⁷ xv. *Ant.* viii. 2 ff.

⁸ Id. viii. 1, xi.

⁹ Id. ix. 5; xvii. *Ant.* vi. 2.

¹⁰ v. *B.J.* iv. 3.

¹¹ xv. *Ant.* xi. 5.

¹² Id. viii. 5, x. 4.

¹³ Id. viii. 4.

and he had begun his reign by slaying most of the Sanhedrin.¹ He also enforced a severer law against house breakers !²

All this, sufficiently monstrous in itself, appears even more flagrant when contrasted with the state of affairs which followed on the assumption of Judæa as a Roman province. The nightmare of Herod's capricious tyranny falls on the earliest chapter of our Lord's life ; it is the Roman authority, with its respect for the native laws of the peoples subject to it, which we feel through the most of the New Testament. The few references to the Sanhedrin under Herod expand to the many of the Gospels and the Acts. What are in evidence throughout these are the chief Jewish court, its procedure, and the gradation of the inferior tribunals. If justice is still abused, the forms of law, at least, are observed or taken for granted.

In 6 A.D., when our Lord was a boy, Judæa was taken from Archelaus and constituted a Roman province, with a governor of equestrian rank entitled Procurator, but in the New Testament called Governor, and subject in cases of emergency to the Legate of Syria.³ The usual residence of the Procurator was Cæsarea, but at the Jewish feasts he came up to Jerusalem. He was in command of all the soldiers in his province, in charge of all the taxes, and, while the lower law was usually left to the native courts, he or his representative could interfere at any point in their procedure, and he alone could render valid their sentences of death.⁴ Under such authority the Sanhedrin resumed that actual government of Jerusalem and the Jewish people of which during Herod's reign they had enjoyed only the

¹ xiv. *Ant.* ix. 4. ² xvi. *Ant.* i. 1.

³ See the full exposition by Schürer, *Gesch.*³ i. 454 ff. (Eng. tr. Div. i. vol. ii. 44 ff.).

⁴ For an exception to this see below.

appearance. From that time, says Josephus in his review of the history of the High Priests, the Jewish "Politeia" became an "Aristokrateia," and the High Priests were entrusted with the "Prostasia," or Presidency of the Nation.¹

The powers and procedure of the Sanhedrin at this time are illustrated in the New Testament, Josephus, and several tractates of the Mishna.² That the powers included authority over the local Sanhedrins,³ not only of Judæa, but of Galilee, Peræa, and even of Jewish settlements beyond, is indisputable so far as the interpretation of the Law and similar abstract questions are concerned, and is extremely probable in regard to other judicial cases. Professor Schürer states that since the death of Herod at least "the civil jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem was confined to Judæa proper"; Galilee and Peræa forming at that time separate spheres of administration.⁴ But Galilee and Peræa continued under a Jewish tetrarch who was on good terms with the native authorities in Jerusalem, and would be ready to carry out their wishes. It is significant that in addressing Galileans our Lord made use of a metaphor which implies the subjection of local courts to the Synedrion or Council,⁵ and Luke tells us that Saul the Pharisee *asked of the High Priest letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any that were of the Way, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem.*⁶ This was not a civil case, but it involved civil penalties, and is an illustration of how difficult it was to draw the distinction which Dr. Schürer suggests. It is true that our Lord is said to have with-

¹ xx. *Ant.* x. (§ 251).

² On Büchler's theory of a second and separate Jewish court for the trial of religious cases see below.

³ *Mishna*, "Sanhedrin," i. 11; cf. Jos. iv. *Ant.* viii. 16, where the local authorities are given as *αἱ ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἡ γερουσία*.

⁴ Div. ii. vol. i. 162, cf. 183.

⁵ Matt. v. 21 ff.

⁶ Acts ix. 1 f.

drawn from Judæa into Galilee in order to avoid the designs of the Pharisees,¹ who by this time had great influence in the Sanhedrin. But this does not imply that "the Sanhedrin had no judicial authority over Him so long as He remained in Galilee."² For when *the Pharisees and Scribes came from Jerusalem* to Him there with questions and *were offended at His answers, He went out thence and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon.*³ In Galilee the arm of the Sanhedrin might take longer to act than in Judæa, just as it might take longer to act in the remote Judæan village of *Ephraim near the wilderness*—to which our Lord also once withdrew⁴—than in Jerusalem; but ultimately it could reach Galilee equally with the remotest parts of Judæa.

The influence of the Sanhedrin haunts our Lord and His disciples everywhere. Just as Herod had spread abroad his spies and himself played the eavesdropper among the people so the Sanhedrin or their agents with this new prophet. A definite gradation is observable in their measures.⁵ At first, according to all the Gospels, it is the popular and pervasive Pharisees who are startled by His influence, begin to question Him and take counsel how they may destroy Him.⁶ These deputations of Pharisees, or of scribes and Pharisees, came down from Jerusalem with questions, upon which, as fearing the power of the Sanhedrin even in Galilee, our Lord withdrew to the Gentile territory of Tyre and Sidon.⁷ From this point Matthew

¹ John iv. 1, vii. 1, cf. 45.

² Schürer as above, 185.

³ Matt. xv. 1, 12, 21.

⁴ John xi. 53 f.

⁵ This in answer to Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, who (it seems to me in direct contradiction of the facts) says that "the Gospels are fond of bringing on the stage from the very beginning the whole Sanhedrin": Eng. tr. v. 132.

⁶ Matt. xii. 2, 14, 24 (*Pharisees*), 38 (*scribes and Phar.*); Mark ii. 24 (*Phar.*), 16 (*scr. and Phar.*), iii. 6 (*Phar. and Herodians*); Luke v. 17 (*Phar. and doctors of the Law*), 21, 30, vi. 7, 11 (*scr. and Phar.*); John ii. 18 (*the Jews*), iv. 1 (*Phar.*), vi. 41 ff. (*Jews*), vii. 32 (*Phar.*).

⁷ Matt. xv. 1, 21; Mark iii. 22, vii. 1; see previous paragraph.

uses a more formal term for the questioning by the Pharisees : *they tried or tested Him*.¹ How aware He was of all the steps their procedure would take appears from His many allusions to these : first, the hatred of one's own family ; then the stirring up of the local courts, *when they persecute you in one city, flee into the next* ² ; then delivery to the provincial synedria, with their prisons and tortures, or to the local synagogues, with their scourgings ³ ; and, in the ultimate background, *governors and kings*, with their powers of life and death.⁴ The capital sentence, indeed, lowered from the beginning : *be not afraid of them which kill the body*.⁵ Nor was the great court, intermediate between the local courts and the governor, out of sight for Himself. When at last He felt its nets about Him and said to His disciples that he must go up to Jerusalem, the seat of the Sanhedrin,⁶ He described it just as the Maccabees did, by the names of its oldest constituents, *elders, chief priests and scribes*,⁷ *who shall condemn Him to death and shall deliver Him unto the Gentiles*—an exact reflection of their regular procedure. *It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem*.⁸

But our more immediate task is to learn the powers and procedure of the Sanhedrin within the City herself. Here there were really three forces for keeping order and dispensing justice : the Sanhedrin ; the Priesthood charged with the watching and discipline of the Temple ; and, when he was in residence, the Procurator, or, in his absence, the Chiliarch, commanding the garrison of at least 500 infantry and a cohort of cavalry.

¹ πειράζειν : Matt. xvi. 1, xix. 3, xxii. 18 ; Mark as early as viii. 11 ; Luke xi. 16 ; cf. John viii. 6.

² Matt. x. 21, 23 ; cf. xxiii. 34.

³ x. 17 : *prisons and tortures* even in the case of debt ; xviii. 25, 34.

⁴ x. 18. ⁵ x. 28.

⁶ Which had the duty of judging a prophet whether he was true or false. ⁷ xvi. 21, xix. 18, Mark x. 33. ⁸ Luke xiii. 33.

Till the appearance of Dr. Büchler's book,¹ the general view has been that there was but one supreme court of the Jews, the Sanhedrin or Synedrion, which met usually in a hall in the southern part of the Temple enclosure, known as the *Lishkath hag-Gâzîth*,² but which under stress of circumstances might also meet elsewhere.³ Their power over Jews was, subject to the Procurator's approval of their sentences of death and his freedom to interfere at other stages, unlimited. According to the Mishna, they alone could try a false prophet or an accused High Priest, or decide whether the king could make an offensive war; and Josephus adds that the king was to do nothing without the High Priest and the opinion of the Senators, and if he affected too much luxury, was to be restrained.⁴ Also, they judged directly accused priests and other persons.⁵ The Mishna adds that Jerusalem could not be added to, or the Temple Courts extended, without their consent.

This view of the Sanhedrin rests upon the evidence of Josephus and the Gospels, with illustrations from the Talmudic literature where this agrees with it, and with the rejection of the rest of the Talmudic evidence as late and unhistorical. Dr. Büchler, however, has made a very thorough examination of the Talmudic evidence, and has come to the conclusion (as we already stated)⁶ that there were two great Jewish tribunals in Jerusalem, with entirely

¹ See above, p. 195.

² "Middoth," v. 4: the βουλή of Jos. v. *B.J.* iv. 2. On the origin of the name see Schürer.

³ Whether the migration related in the *Mishna* "Shabbath," 15a, and elsewhere, that "40 years before the Temple was destroyed" the S. held its sessions in the bazaars (*ḥanûyôth*), be historical or not, it implies that the S. could meet elsewhere than in the Temple Courts, unless by the *ḥanûyôth* be meant the merchants' booths in the outer court.

⁴ "Sanhedrin," i. 1, 5, ii. 2, 4, xi.; Jos. iv. *Ant.* viii. 17.

⁵ Besides "Sanhedrin" see "Middoth," v. 4.

⁶ Above, p. 195.

distinct powers—one, the Synedrion of Josephus and the Gospels, with civil authority; and one, the Synedrion with a purely religious authority.¹ The former, he thinks Josephus has shown, sat in the town or at the west edge of the Temple mount²; the latter was entitled “The Great Beth-Din which was” or “sat in the Lishkath hag-Gâzith,”³ on the south of the inner Temple Court, with an entrance also to the outer court. This second tribunal had to decide on the purity of the priests,⁴ and other purely religious matters which were the duty, not of a body mixed of priests and laity, like the other Synedrion, but of a purely priestly body⁵; and neither Josephus nor the Gospels report of their Synedrion that it judged cases concerning the priests or the Temple service, or any religious questions, but exclusively judicial processes, penal sentences, and perhaps cases of a political nature.⁶ It is not possible, in the end of an article, to discuss either these matters fully or the rest of the evidence which Dr. Büchler draws so carefully from the Talmudic literature. I must content myself with these criticisms. There is no evidence either in Josephus or the Gospels of a second supreme tribunal or Synedrion in Jerusalem. Had this existed, Josephus must surely have had occasion to allude to it, if not to describe it. On the contrary, he knows only one Synedrion; and implies the unity of the authority under which the Jews

¹ *Das Synedrion in Jerus. u. das grosse Beth-Din in der Quaderkammer des Jerus. Tempels*: “Die genaue unvoreingenommene Prüfung dieser Überlieferungen ergibt eine sichere, bisher kaum geahnte Erkenntniss über das Synedrion in der Quaderkammer des Tempels, nämlich die der völligen Verschiedenheit dieser Behörde u. des Synedrions der Evangelien u. des Josephus, ihrer Zusammensetzung, ihrer Häupter, ihrer Befugnisse u. ihrer Stellung”: p. 4.

² Jos. v. *B.J.* iv. 2; cf. vi. *B.J.* vi. 3.

³ *Mishna* “Sanh.” xi. 2; cf. *Sifra*, p. 19a.

⁴ *Mishna*, “Middoth,” v. 3, 4.

⁵ Büchler, 33 f.

⁶ Id. 36.

conducted all the affairs of their life. With this the evidence we have reviewed of the constitutional history of Israel before the time of Josephus agrees. We have found no trace in it of a second and separate court. Moreover, the whole principle of the Jewish constitution implied the unity or coherence of the religious and civil sides of the national life ; and in practice it was (as we have seen above) impossible to separate them. To these considerations we may add, without going into the question of the position of the *Lishkath hag-Gâzîth*, that even Dr. Büchler admits the possibility of a court mixed of priests and laity, meeting there.¹ And, on the other side, his difficulty about a mixed court deciding purely priestly questions, may be met by the hypothesis that these were left to the priestly members of the Synedrion alone to decide. We have seen a precedent for such an arrangement in the division of the court recorded (? or suggested) by the Chronicler.²

At their command the Sanhedrin must have had a number of officers to execute their decrees and make arrests : *hyperetai* as the Gospels call them, *constables* or *bailiffs*,³ and servants of the High Priest,⁴ whom Josephus describes as enlisted "from the rudest and most restless characters" by both the High Priest for the collection of tithes, and by the leaders of factions, "the principal men of the multitude of Jerusalem."⁵

The Temple discipline is fully set forth in the *Mishna*, and will be found summarized in Dr. Schürer's *History*. How the Temple was separately fortified and carefully watched there is no room to set forth here.

But as the Temple was a "Keep overhanging the City, so

¹ p. 19. ² Above, pp. 200 f.

³ Matt. v. 25. In Luke xii. 58 called *πράκτωρ*, *exactor*, collector of debts, and probably also of tithes.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 51 ; Mark xiv. 47 ; John xviii. 10.

⁵ Jos. xx. *Ant.* viii. 8, ix. 2.

was Antonia to the Temple.”¹ This fortress stood on a rock some 75 feet high, at the north-west corner of the Temple enclosure, to the cloisters of which its garrison—part but not all of the cohort of Rome’s auxiliary troops in Jerusalem²—descended by the gangways or stairs, and “taking up positions in open order round the colonnades, kept guard over the people at the feasts, so that no revolt might take place.”³ Luke calls the commander by his regimental rank Chiliarch, but Josephus Phrouriarch, or commander of the garrison.⁴ That they garrisoned other towers in Jerusalem and so acted as the city police, is both likely and implied by Josephus⁵; and that some of them assisted in the arrest of our Lord would not be surprising. But John’s Gospel says that Judas received the *Speira* as well as the officers from the chief priests, and *Speira* is to the Book of Acts the whole cohort, but to Polybius a *manipulus*, or two centuries. No other Gospel includes Roman soldiers among the band which arrested Jesus.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Jos. v. *B.J.* v. 8; cf. xv. *Ant.* xi. 4.

² xx. *Ant.* v. 3.

³ v. *B.J.* v. 8.

⁴ Acts xxi. etc.; xv. *Ant.* xi. 4, xviii. *Ant.* iv. 3.

⁵ See above, n. 3.

TARSUS.

XXII. ROMAN METAPHORS.

IT has been pointed out in the preceding section that St. Paul's favourite metaphors and comparisons, intended to explain the intensity of devotion required for the proper living of the Christian life, are drawn from the stadium and the racecourse. The careful preparatory training for a great race, the self-denial and self-restraint in training, the strict rules of the competition, the concentration of the entire energy and powers of mind and body on the one ultimate aim, the eagerness to win a reward whose value lay entirely in the mental estimate which the initiated placed upon it, and not in external monetary value—all these conditions corresponded to his conception of the divine life and the spirit in which it must be led. But such constantly recurring comparisons could not have been made, if the Apostle had regarded the whole circle of athletics, the palaestra and the stadium, with the abhorrence that the narrow Jews of Palestine felt. We inferred that this department of his vocabulary and his thought originates in his early experiences as a child brought up amid the surroundings of a Hellenistic city, familiarized with the conduct of the racecourse. The spirit of the competitors in the course was, on the whole, one of the best and healthiest facts of Greek city life. Paul had learned this from participating in the life of a Hellenic city as a boy; there is no other way in which the lesson can be learned so thoroughly as to sink into the man's nature and dominate his thought and language as this topic dominates Paul's.

When Ignatius compares the Christian life to a religious procession, with a long train of rejoicing devotees clad in the appropriate garments, bearing their religious symbols

and holy things through the public streets, we see that he was at times ruled insensibly by old ideas and scenes familiar to him in earlier life. As a general rule, he regarded his old pagan life with shame as a cause of humiliation ; yet thoughts and associations connected with it directed his mind and his expression.¹ No Jew brought up from the beginning to regard pagan ceremonial as simply hateful could have used the comparison.

But it is easy to carry this method to an extreme which lands it in absurdity. Dean Howson, in his *Metaphors of St. Paul*, the last chapter of which we praised and freely used in the preceding Section, devotes two chapters to the military metaphors and the architectural metaphors in the Apostle's letters. If his estimate of these is as reasonable as we consider his account of the athletic metaphors to be, then, by the same train of argument, Paul must have been as familiar with and interested in Roman military methods and Greek architectural details as with the spirit and eagerness of the victorious athlete ; which is absurd. But, when you look at the military metaphors, there is hardly one which is not of quite a vague and general kind. Wherever Dean Howson finds the word "fight" or "build," he detects an allusion to a Roman army or a Greek temple. But there were soldiers before Rome was heard of, and houses were built before the form of the Greek temple had been evolved. The most pacific and unmilitary of mortals will often use the word "fight." Persons absolutely ignorant of the shape of a Greek temple may be specially given to using the word "build."

These words have passed into the universal language of mankind, and are constantly used without any distinct thought of the original department of life from which they are adopted. They are not peculiar to St. Paul in the New

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 159 ff.

Testament : the verb "to build" occurs there thirty-one times outside of his writings and ten times in them. The word "builder" once outside, while he never uses it. The noun "building" is not so unfavourable to the Dean's view : it is found four times outside the Pauline letters, and fifteen times in them ; moreover Paul shows a marked tendency to employ the word in the moral sphere to describe the building up of character and holiness. But this peculiarity is not favourable to the supposition of architectural experience and training, for in comparison with other writers in the New Testament he displays less familiarity with the original process and inclines to use the word only in the transferred sense, which implies that he was not consciously thinking of the metaphor, nor making the metaphor for the first time, but was adopting a previously existing mode of expressing the moral fact.

It is quite different in the case of the athletic metaphors. In many of them it is quite clear from the passage that Paul was consciously and deliberately using the metaphor as such ; and it is highly probable that he was the first to strike out this use of the words. The Greek language of Christian theology was created by him, and never lost the character he had impressed on it : so Tertullian was mainly influential in devising a Latin expression for the Greek Christian theology.

The whole of Dean Howson's discussion of architectural Pauline metaphors comes to practically nothing, so far as concerns his thesis that the Apostle was thinking in them of the classical Greek temple. In so far as he was conscious of his architectural metaphors—and in some places he was clearly conscious—he was thinking of the house, not of the temple. It is a necessary rule in estimating the nature of metaphor that it must be presumed (apart from any special reason) to be drawn from the realm that is most familiar

to the writer. Now Paul was certainly quite familiar with the process of building a house ; but he may never actually have seen a Greek temple in building. Yet Dean Howson is convinced that it was the Classical temple, resting on columns and splendidly decorated, that floated always before Paul's mind and determined his expression.

The degree to which the Dean presses his statistics is shown by the following : on page 47 he says that the verb "edify" and its substantive "edification" occur about twenty times in the New Testament, and are with one exception used by St. Paul alone, and the one exception is in Acts, a book "written almost certainly under his superintendence." The passage of Acts is ix. 31, and it is straining facts to rely on this as an example of Pauline metaphor. Moreover, the very words "being edified and walking in the fear of the Lord" prove that the writer had no sense of the original realm from which the metaphor was derived, but was using a word which had passed into the language of Christian moral philosophy (quite possibly and even probably through the influence of Paul, who in his turn used it rather philosophically than with conscious metaphor). Such statistics from the English Version are misleading. We have stated the facts regarding the Greek words for building, and they are not favourable to the Dean's view.

Throughout the military metaphors, some of which are clearly conscious and intended, there are none which even in the slightest degree suggest any real interest in or familiarity with military matters ; they are all quite popular ; and there are only two which are certainly Roman in character. All the rest are simply military in general, they are not Roman any more than they are Greek : they relate to the popular conception of the soldier *in genere*. Even the allusion in 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4, which probably implies a professional soldier, who "does not entangle himself with the

common affairs of life," would be quite well satisfied by the mercenaries who were a common feature of the later Greek or Graeco-Asiatic kingdoms and armies. The two exceptions are the two striking allusions to the triumph, which are resonant of the dignity and majesty of Rome.

The first is in Colossians ii. 15 (14) : " the bond (consisting in ordinances) which was opposed to us he hath taken out of the way, nailing it to the cross : (15) having stripped off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, celebrating a triumph over them in his crucifixion."

The other passage is a more detailed picture of the long train of the Roman triumph, with incense and spices perfuming the streets, when the chiefs of the defeated people were taken into the Mamertine prison on the side of the Capitol, and there strangled, as the procession was ascending the slope of the Capitoline hill. " Thanks be to God, who always leads us (his soldiers) in the train of His triumph,¹ and makes manifest through us the fragrance of His knowledge in every place : for we are a fragrance of Christ unto God, in them that are being saved and in them that are perishing."

In these passages speaks the Roman ; and they are the only two passages in all the letters of Paul in which I fancy that one can catch the tone of the Roman citizen. Nothing is sufficient to express the completeness and absoluteness of the Divine victory except a Roman triumph. How different is this from the way in which the writer of the Apocalypse strives to find expression for the same idea.

There is in these two Pauline passages a striking analogy to the passage just cited from Ignatius, who found

¹ Lightfoot on Col. ii. 14 seems to take this in the sense " celebrates his triumph over us as his conquered foes." I think the meaning taken above is better : " we are the soldiers who march behind him in his triumph," as the soldiers of the victorious army always did.

nothing so suited to describe the Christian life as a religious procession through the streets of a city. As in the one passage you recognize the pagan and probably the priest, so in the other you recognize the Roman citizen. It would be a perfectly legitimate inference to deduce from these passages that Paul was a Roman ; but, had he himself not mentioned his standing in the Empire, the inference would have been derided by the critics as fanciful and incredible.

XXIII. UNIVERSITY TEACHING AT TARSUS.

It is convenient to use the term University in speaking of educational facilities in Hellenic cities ; but the name must not be taken to indicate such strictly organized and incorporated institutions as the Universities in our country at the present day. But there were in the chief Hellenic cities real Universities, for the intention was to provide in them public instruction by qualified lecturers in all the branches of science and literature¹ recognized at the time. In accordance with the Greek ideal of city life, the sole ultimate authority in the University lay in the hands of the people. All teaching in the city was for the benefit of the people, and the popular assembly alone had the right to dictate the manner and the terms according to which it should be given. This authority was similar to that which Parliament exercises in the last resort in our country, but more direct and practically effective ; and the state was then much less willing to permit a University corporation to regulate its own affairs in ordinary course. Such regulation as did then exist was to a much greater degree exercised by the municipal authority than is now the case. Edinburgh University, in its close subordination to the Town Council—as was the rule until about the middle of the nineteenth century—showed more resemblance to the old Greek system than any other of our Universities.

¹ ἐν κύκλῳ παιδείας, Strab., p. 675.

How the authority was exercised in Tarsus we have no means of determining. The story of Athenodorus, who was undoubtedly authoritative in the University and in the city alike, shows that there was a real connexion between them ; but it was only under exceptional conditions that a man who ranked primarily as the leading man in the University could exercise such influence in the city. When he returned to settle in Tarsus he tried the experiment of relying on the natural influence which a man of his standing and experience enjoyed in a free community ; and this experiment was a failure. He then had recourse to the exceptional and unconstitutional powers which the Emperor had entrusted to him.

In the Greek cities generally, to a much greater extent than with us, the lecturers in the University looked directly to the city authority, so far as they looked to any controlling power. To a much greater extent than with us they attained their position by a sort of natural selection and survival of the fittest. A lecturer was permitted to enter any city as a wandering scholar, and might begin publicly to dispute and to lecture (as Paul did in Athens and in Ephesus and elsewhere), if he could attract an audience. The city could, if it thought fit, interfere to take cognizance of his lecturing, and either stop him, if it seemed advisable, or give him formal permission to continue. Apparently there was no definite or uniform rule in the matter, but each individual case was determined on its own merits. Any person was free to call attention in the public interest to a new lecturer : that was a practically universal rule in ancient cities : the state depended on individuals to invoke its intervention. When thus called upon, the state authority decided whether there was any need to take cognizance of the matter : the decision would depend on the information laid before it and on the weight which the informer

carried with him. All that is a universal and necessary feature of Greek city government ; and it implies that there was some public board or council or individual magistrate before whom information could be laid. In Athens it seems certain that the Court of Areopagus was the authoritative body. In Ephesus it may possibly have been a court of Asiarchs. As to Tarsus we have no information.

If the new lecturer, when attention was called to him, was found suitable and approved, this must have given him a regular and legal standing. If disapproval were expressed, he would probably find that it was advisable to try his fortune in another city. Paul apparently did so even when his case was adjourned for further consideration ; and possibly in such cases that verdict may have been understood as one of mild disapproval. In cases where grave disapproval was felt the city had always the right to send away any person whose presence in it was for its disadvantage ; though, under Roman rule, such right of expulsion was certainly liable to revision at the hands of the Imperial officials, if the expelled person was sufficiently influential to be able to appeal to a high Roman officer.

As to the position of a lecturer who had been approved, we have very little information ; and practice doubtless varied in different cities. In some cases he enjoyed a salary from the state. How far he was allowed to charge fees is uncertain ; probably there was no uniform rule ; Paul charged no fees, and his practice was probably not unique, but he certainly makes rather a merit of the fact that neither individuals nor communities were put to expense by him, and he distinctly states it as a general rule, that the labourer was worthy of his hire and that payment for instruction was deserved. It is however in accordance with the spirit of ancient life that the lecturers

depended for their livelihood more on special gifts from grateful individuals than on fees charged universally for the privilege of listening.

Strabo, who is practically our sole authority, gives a very sympathetic and favourable picture of the University of Tarsus. He was perhaps biassed to some extent by his friendship for Athenodorus ; but he was an eye-witness and an authority of the highest value. His account has sometimes, however, been misunderstood, and quoted in the sense that the three Universities of Tarsus, Athens, and Alexandria were the outstanding Universities of the world, and that of the three Tarsus was the best.

On the contrary, when Strabo is read carefully it is quite evident that the Tarsian school of philosophy was a provincial place, which had no reputation outside the city and attracted no students from the rest of the world. But there was in the city and the district around such enthusiasm for philosophy and for education generally that Tarsian students crowded the lectures ; and in this respect Tarsus outshone the two great Universities, Athens and Alexandria, not to mention any of the others. In Athens and in the mass of the Universities the lectures were attended mainly by strangers, while few people of the country swelled the audience. In Alexandria there were both many natives and many strangers in attendance. Tarsus was able to crowd its own lecture-halls and to send numbers of its natives to complete their education abroad, and few of those who went abroad ever returned to their native place. Rome in particular was full of Tarsians ; and, as we have seen, some of these exercised real influence on Roman history through their personal influence with the Imperial family.

While Strabo shows clearly that Tarsus was not one of the great Universities in general estimation, he shows also

that it was rich in what constitutes the true excellence and strength of a University, intense enthusiasm and desire for knowledge among the students and great ability and experience among some at least of the teachers. The collision between Athenodorus and the gang of Boëthos (as already described) may be taken to some extent as a struggle for mastery between the University and the uneducated rabble, which had attained power partly through exceptional circumstances and partly through the deep-seated faults of the Greek democratic system. The coarseness and vulgarity of the latter ought not to be quoted (as they have been quoted by Dean Farrar) as an example of University conduct and life in Tarsus. Philostratus, writing at the beginning of the third century, gives a very unfavourable picture of the University of Tarsus in the reign of Tiberius about the year that Strabo was writing, and mentions that Apollonius of Tyana, when he went to study there, was so offended with the manners of the citizens, their love of pleasure, their insolence, and their fondness for fine clothing, that he left the University and went to continue his studies at Aegae, on the Cilician coast farther to the east. But the work of Philostratus is unhistorical; in some degree he may be expressing the opinion entertained about the wealthy Tarsus in his own country and time (about A.D. 200), but to a large extent he was guided, I think, by the criticisms which Dion Chrysostom freely uttered in his two Orations to the Tarsians; and cannot be seriously weighed against Strabo's authority.

XXIV. ST. PAUL'S THEORY OF PAGAN RELIGION.

The view which St. Paul entertained, and states clearly in his letter to the Romans, is that there existed originally in the world a certain degree of knowledge about God and His character and His relation to mankind; but the de-

liberate action of man had vitiated this fair beginning ; and the reason lay in idolatry. This cause obscures the first good ideas as to the nature of God ; and thus the Divine Being is assimilated to and represented by images in the shape of man who is mortal, and birds and quadrupeds and reptiles. In idolatrous worship a necessary and invariable accompaniment was immorality, which goes on increasing from bad to worse in physical passions, and thus corrupts the whole nature and character of man (Rom. i. 19 ff.).

But men are never so utterly corrupt that a return to truth is impossible. If they only wish it, they can choose the good and refuse the evil (Rom. ii. 14 f.). The Gentiles have not the Law revealed to the Jews, but some of them through their better nature act naturally according to the Law, and are a Law unto themselves : the practical effect of the Law is seen in their life because it has been by nature written in their hearts and they have a natural sense of the distinction between right and wrong, between good and evil ; and their conscience works in harmony with this natural Law in their hearts, prompting them to choose the right action and making them conscious of wrong if they choose wrong action. This beginning of right never fails utterly in human nature, but it is made faint and obscure by wrong doing, when men deliberately choose the evil and will not listen to the voice of God in their hearts.

Yet even at the worst there remains in the most corrupted man a sense that out of this evil good will come. We all are in some degree aware that evil is wrong, because it is painful, and the pain is the preparation for the birth of better things (Rom. viii. 19-22). The eager watching expectancy of the universe [man and nature alike, as of a runner with his eye fixed on the goal], waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of man

who subjected it, and in this subjection there arises a hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption so as to attain unto the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation in all its parts is groaning in the birth-pangs from which shall emerge a better condition, and we also who are Christians and have already within ourselves the first practical effects of the Spirit's action, are still in the pain and hope of the nascent redemption.

This remarkable philosophic theory of Paul's bursts the bonds of the narrower Judaism. It is not inconsistent with the best side of Hebrew thought and prophecy ; but it was utterly and absolutely inconsistent with the practical facts of the narrower Judaism in his time. The man who thought thus could not remain in permanent harmony with the party in Jerusalem which was inexorably opposed to the early followers of Christ. It was only in maturer years that Paul became fully and clearly conscious of this truth ; but as he became able to express it clearly to himself and to others, he also became conscious that it had been implicit from the beginning in his early thought. He had it in his nature from birth. It was fostered and kept alive by the circumstances of his childhood. He had come in contact with pagans, and knew that they were not monsters (as they seemed to the Palestinian zealots), but human beings. He had been in such relations with them, that he felt it a duty to go and tell them of the truth which had been revealed (Rom. i. 14). He had learned by experience of the promptings to good, of the preference for the right, of self-blame for wrong-doing, which were clearly manifest in their nature. He had also been aware of that deep and eager longing for the coming of something better, of a new era, of a Saviour, of God incarnate in human form on the earth, which was so remarkable a feature in Roman life before and after his birth.

For our present purpose the important aspect of this philosophic view is that it was inherited and learned in Tarsus. It was in the Tarsian religion that Paul detected the fundamental ideas of good amid the vast accretion of abomination and evil which had been built up over and round those initial ideas. It was through the mouth of some of the teachers in its University, expounding the ideas of Athenodorus, that he had heard a distinct and noble expression of the distinction between right and wrong, and a philosophic demonstration (in words, not in power) of the existence in man of an inborn ineradicable faculty to recognize the right. It was among the men who moved in the society of Tarsus that he had seen some who, "knowing not the Law, were a law unto themselves," who were living examples of the power and the truth of conscience. It was in the philosophy of Athenodorus that he had heard or read the complaint against the state to which the world had been reduced by evil and the belief expressed in the possibility of a better state of society.

What then was the religion of Tarsus ? We are not here concerned to describe the evil, the vice and the deception involved in it as a practical working factor in the life of the city, but to investigate the fundamental ideas of wisdom and right which Paul describes in the passages just quoted from *Romans*.

XXV. THE RELIGION OF TARSUS.

The Religion of Tarsus is an extremely complicated subject, and the information which has been preserved is far too scanty to permit anything like a satisfactory account of it. Several steps in its development can be distinguished with certainty : others are probable : but many are quite obscure.

No religious fact was lost in the growth of an ancient city.

When a new people settled in an ancient city, they brought their religion with them, but they did not destroy the previously existing religion any more than they exterminated the older population. A certain amalgamation of the religions of the old and the new race was formed ; as e.g. at Athens when a race of Poseidon worshippers settled beside and among the older worshippers of Athena, a certain male figure, named Erechtheus, who formed part of the divine group in the Athena religion, was in the state cultus identified with Poseidon, and thus Athena and Poseidon-Erechtheus were associated in a joint worship and a common temple.

In Tarsus we can say with certainty that the early Ionian immigrants found an older population and an older religion already in possession. Certain elements in the later Tarsian religion can be distinguished as being in all probability pre-Ionian, others as Ionian. The Assyrian domination doubtless affected the religion of the country. The Persian period left unmistakable traces, which appear on the coins. The new foundation of the Hellenic Tarsus about 170 B.C. must inevitably have given a distinctly more Hellenized aspect to the state cultus, though it is very doubtful whether it had much effect on its real nature. Only the Jewish element remained separate, and did not affect the state religion, though it certainly must have affected strongly the character and views of many individuals, and produced that circle of believing or devout persons of pagan origin who in every city surrounded the Synagogue. It was precisely because the Jewish religion was so incapable of amalgamation with the others that the Hellenes of those cities complained ; the Jews really stood outside of the city union. In Tarsus the Jews seem to have been in a less degree an alien element than elsewhere, so far as the scanty evidence justifies an opinion.

The principal deity in Tarsus was the one who is styled on coins with Aramaic legends of the Persian and early Seleucid period, Baal-Tarz, the Lord of Tarsus. He also appears frequently on coins of the Hellenic Tarsus, and sometimes in the Roman Imperial time. He is represented in the character and position appropriated to Zeus in Greek art, sitting on a chair, resting his raised left hand on a long upright sceptre, and holding out in his right hand objects varying on different coins and at different periods, but most frequently either an ear of corn and a bunch of grapes, or a figure of Victory. The latter, which is more Hellenic, is more frequent in the Roman time, the corn and grapes are commonest in the earlier period, and mark this god as the old Anatolian deity, the giver of corn and wine. On the top of the sceptre sits often the sacred bird, the eagle.

These same symbols are carried in the hands of the god, who is sculptured of colossal size on the rocks above the great springs at Ibriz, on the north side of Tarsus. He is there represented as the peasant-god, dressed simply in short tunic, high boots, and tall pointed head-dress with horns in front, bearing in his hand the gifts which he has bestowed on mankind by his toil, the corn and the grapes. Sculptured there long before the Hellenic period of Anatolian history, he shows only the native character, without a trace of Greek influence, but with strong Assyrian influence. This god of Ibriz is the embodiment of the toiling agriculturist, who by the work of his hands has redeemed the soil for tillage, gathered out the stones from it, conducted the water to it, ploughed it and sowed in it the corn, or planted it with trees and tended them and cleaned them till they bear their fruit.

But that is not the Lord of Tarsus. The deity who sits on a chair, wearing simply the loose himation, which could only impede active exertion, and holding the sceptre, is not

the peasant-god, who by the labour of his hands has produced the corn and the wine, but the supreme god who gives rain and fruitful seasons and their gifts, who without exertion by the simple word of his power bestows his benefits on mankind.

This distinction between the supreme deity and the working god was one that lay deep in the Anatolian religion. It was expressed by the rude people of Lystra when they saluted Barnabas and Paul as gods. Paul was to them Hermes, and Barnabas was the supreme god and father Zeus: such at least are the names in the Greek translation, for we unfortunately are denied the names that were employed in the Lycaonian language. I cannot illustrate the distinction better than by quoting a few lines written in 1895.¹ "The same qualities which mark out Paul to us as the leader, marked him out to the populace of Lycaonia as the agent and subordinate. The western mind regards the leader as the active and energetic partner; but the Oriental mind considers the leader to be the person who sits still and does nothing, while his subordinates speak and work for him. Hence in the truly Oriental religions the chief god sits apart from the world, communicating with it through his messenger and subordinate. The more statuesque figure of Barnabas was therefore taken by the Orientals as the chief god, and the active orator, Paul, as his messenger, communicating his wishes to men. Incidentally, we may notice both the diametrical antithesis of this conception of the Divine nature to the Christian conception, and also the absolute negation of the Oriental conception in Christ's words to His disciples, 'whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant' " (Matt. xx. 26).

This distinction was evident to the Greeks in their ex-

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 84.

pression of the Anatolian religion. The supreme god is usually called by the name of their supreme deity Zeus. The working god is in the south-eastern cities of Asia Minor most frequently identified with Heracles, the hero labouring under a cruel taskmaster, who slays monsters, drains marshes, and gives fertile land to agriculture ; but he is also envisaged under other aspects, especially as Apollo the seer of the Divine will, or Hermes the messenger who intimates the Divine purpose to men.

But it is never the case that those envisagements of the Divine nature are fixed and stereotyped. On the contrary they are fluid, shifting, often in a way interchangeable, even though they are so strongly distinguished. Thus the supreme god in Anatolia is the giver of signs and revealer of his will as Zeus Semanticus, and the giver of corn and wine and the fruits of the earth and all things good and beautiful, as Zeus Karpodotes and Kalokagathios. So the Lord of Tarsus holds in his hands the corn and the grapes, which at Ibriz the Peasant God bestows upon his votaries.

The working god, the subordinate, was as a rule conceived as the son, the supreme god as the father. But in the cycle of the life of the gods, the father is the son, and the son the father. "The bull is the father of the serpent, and the serpent of the bull" : such was the expression in the Phrygian mysteries ; and it well illustrates the element abominated by St. Paul as the cause of the degradation and hatefulness of the popular religion. But, in spite of the fluid character of these Divine ideas, it is possible in a certain degree to separate them and to contemplate each by itself in the Tarsian religion and the religion of south-western Anatolia generally.

We distinguish the young and active deity in a figure of thoroughly Oriental type, common on Tarsian coins throughout Greek and Roman times : he stands on a winged

and horned lion, wearing a tall pointed headdress, with bow-case on his shoulder and sword girt at his side : he holds up in front of him his right hand, often with a branch or a flower in it, while with his left he grasps a double-headed battle-axe. The branch marks him out as the god of purification, who teaches the ceremonies and rules for the expiation of guilt and the cleansing of impurity. The flower is perhaps the symbol of curative power, as Mr. J. G. Frazer points out.¹

This god is often shown on coins within a curious structure, which most probably represents a portable shrine. It is a pyramidal structure resting on a broad pedestal, and the god on his lion stands upon the pedestal inside the pyramidal covering. On the top of the pyramid often perches the divine eagle. Sometimes the pyramid is shaded by a semicircular canopy supported by two young beardless men wearing tunics : the men stand on the pedestal on which the pyramidal structure rests.

This quaint representation must probably be regarded as an attempt to show in the small space of a coin a large erection, which was a feature in an annual procession in honour of the god. Some of the coins attempt, and some do not attempt, to show the human beings, doubtless young men chosen from the city, who bore a canopy over the holy structure. The whole was carried through the streets on a great platform ; and we must presume that it was drawn by animals or by a train of devotees.

Now there was a festival at Tarsus, in which the burning of a pyre was one of the chief ceremonies ; and this took place in honour of a god, whom Dion Chrysostom calls Heracles. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that this pyre, the centre of one of the greatest Tarsian religious

¹ He kindly sent me an early copy of his *Adonis Attis Osiris*, which reached me just in time to aid in the correction of the proof sheets of these pages.

festivals, was the object so often represented on the coins of the city. It was constructed for the occasion, and the god was burned in it as the crowning scene of the ceremonial. The periodic burning of the god represented his translation to heaven.¹ The eagle which bore the Trojan Ganymede to heaven perched on the apex of the pyramid in the Tarsian rite.

The character of this deity, the weapons which he carries, and his death on a funeral pyre, all combined to force on the Greeks the identification with their own Heracles. This they could not possibly avoid. The Tarsian deity is on the coins generally draped in a long tunic reaching to the feet, but sometimes nude. The former appearance may be taken as true to the actual religious presentation; the latter is a Greek touch, helping to make out the analogy with Heracles.

These two figures we take as primitive Anatolian, part of the oldest Tarsian religion, which lasted through all stages of the city's history with little or no alteration.

The great number and variety of representations of Heracles on coins of Tarsus and other cities of south-eastern Anatolia may all be interpreted through the play of Greek artistic fancy with the type of the young Anatolian deity. The young toiling god, however, lent himself readily to other assimilations besides that with Heracles. It is a common thing in the transforming fancy of Greek religious myth to connect with the god a hero, who is really a sort of repetition of the god on a lower plane nearer the level of human nature: so e.g. Heracles varies in the Greek conception between a god and a hero. All the numerous representations of the hero Perseus on coins of the south-eastern region of Asia Minor are probably to be taken in association with this young god. Perseus is the immigrant

¹ I take this from Frazer *loc. cit.* p. 99, but am inclined to distinguish the branch from the flower as religious symbols: he identifies them.

hero, who is connected artificially with the older religion of the country. He represents a new people and a new power. In him probably are united features both of Persian and of Greek character ; but the Greek element seems to predominate strongly. He comes from the side of the sea ; he is specially connected with Argive legend ; but he comes also as the horseman, who crosses the sea by flying over it. It may be supposed that a religious envisagement which gave mythical justification to the Persian rule by connecting a Persian hero with the native religion, was caught up by the later Greek colonists in the Seleucid period and Hellenized so far that little was left of the Persian idea.

We recognize a god of the early Ionian settlers in an Apollo of archaic character, who often appears on coins of the Imperial time, a nude figure grasping in his hands two dogs (or wolves, perhaps), one by the forelegs, and one by the ears, which hang down to the ground on each side of him. Representations of Artemis and Apollo of this type were common in archaic Greek times. They are rather pre-Hellenic and Oriental than Hellenic in character, and are peculiarly suitable to a really pre-Hellenic people such as the old Ionians were. Some Tarsian coins show Perseus adoring the archaic Apollo : the new Greek colonists naturally recognized the early Ionian god.

The Persian deity Ahura-mazda appears on Tarsian coins struck under the satrap Tiribazus about 386-380 B.C. He has the body of a man terminating below in the broad-winged solar disk ; he carries a wreath in the right hand, and a flower in the left. This deity had no traceable lasting influence on Tarsian religion, and in general the Persian rule and religion left little permanent mark on the history and religion of Asia Minor, though the Persian Artemis was familiar in later Lydian religion, and Cappadocia was strongly affected by Persian influence.

W. M. RAMSAY,

THE USE OF TESTIMONIES IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

INTRODUCTION.

Existence of Books of Testimonies Suspected.

THE existence in the early Church of collections of testimonies, extracted from the Old Testament for use against the Jews, has for a long time been a matter of suspicion. It was in the highest degree probable that such collections should arise, and their value for controversial purposes was so obvious that they would readily pass into the form of written books, and be subject to the correction, amplification, or excision of editors in such a way as to constitute in themselves a cycle of patristic literature, the main lines of whose development can easily be traced and the variations of whose development from one period of Church life to another can often be detected. They arose out of the exigency of controversy, and therefore covered the wide ground of canonical Jewish literature; but they were, at the same time, subject, to the exigency of the controversialist, who, travelling from place to place, could not carry a whole library with him. It was, therefore, *a priori*, probable that they would be little books of wide range. The parallel which suggests itself to one's mind is that of the little handbook known as the Soldier's Pocket Bible, which was carried by the Ironsides of Cromwell, and was composed of a series of Biblical extracts, chiefly from the Old Testament, defining the duty of the Puritan soldier in the various circumstances in which he found himself, and

arranged under the headings of questions appropriate to the situation.

As we have said, these collections have been suspected to exist by a number of students of early Patristic literature, though, as we hope to show, they have not, all of them, adequately realized the antiquity of the first forms in which Testimonies were circulated. It will be proper to draw attention to the way in which these suspicions have been expressed.

For example, the late Dr. Hatch, in his *Essays on Biblical Greek*, wrote as follows : ¹

It may naturally be supposed that a race which laid stress on moral progress, whose religious services had variable elements of both prayer and praise, and which was carrying on an *active propaganda*, would have, among other books, *manuals* of morals, of devotion and of *controversy*. It may also be supposed, if we take into consideration the contemporary habit of making collections of *excerpta*, and the special authority which the Jews attached to their sacred books, that some of their manuals would consist of extracts from the Old Testament. The existence of composite quotations in the New Testament and in some of the early Fathers suggests the hypothesis that we have in these relics of such manuals.

Manuals of controversy, such as Dr. Hatch imagines to be the apparatus of a Jewish missionary in early times, might perhaps be described as *Testimonia pro Judaeis*, and, if such existed, there is nothing to forbid their having been produced by the Hellenists of the prae-Christian period, as well as by those of a later date. What we are concerned with, however, is not *Testimonies on behalf of the Jews*, whose force would not be very great except with those who were already well on the way to conviction of the truth of Judaism ; but *Testimonies against Jews*, of the nature of a series of *Argumenta ad hominem*, where the man was identified with his own religion and then refuted from it. And it is only neces-

¹ Hatch : *l.c.* p. 203, quoted [and italicized] by me in *EXPOSITOR* for September, 1905.

sary to say here of the very illuminating sentence quoted from Dr. Hatch, that if such collections of Testimonies on behalf of the Jews existed in early times, before the diffusion of Christianity, then there must have been, *a fortiori*, similar collections produced in later times, when the Christian religion was being actively pushed by the Church in the Synagogue. It is, of course, possible also that those phenomena on which Hatch's observations turned, such as the early existence of composite quotations from the Septuagint, may belong to the class of Testimonies *against* the Jews, and not to Testimonies *on behalf* of them. In which case the error in not recognizing their character would be due to the want of a right sense of the antiquity of this form of Christian propaganda.

In his recent work on the *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, Dr. Drummond has expressed the same suspicion, though with a modest apology for wandering into the region of conjecture. He is pointing out ¹ the difficulties into which the successive translators of the Old Testament into Greek were driven by the necessarily controversial use which was to be made of their translations. "It may have become," says he, "a matter of common knowledge among those who cared for the Scriptures, that certain passages required emendation. The Christians would naturally turn their attention to Messianic quotations; and it is conceivable that there may have grown up, whether in writing or not, an anthology of passages useful in controversy, which differed more or less from the current Greek translation. This is, of course, only conjecture"; but I think it affords a possible explanation of the phenomenon of the Johannine quotations."

This also is an illuminating statement; it recognizes that collections of Messianic passages may have antedated

¹ Drummond, *l.c.* p. 365.

the Fourth Gospel, and that they may have been written collections, made by Christians. If the hypothesis is a correct one, then we are very near indeed to the suggestion that *Testimonies against the Jews* are amongst the earliest deposits of the Christian literature.

Early Collections of Testimonies against the Jews are still Extant.

When we begin to explore into the region of Christian literature for evidences as to the formal use of Old Testament prophecies in controversies with the Jews, we find the confirmation required, not only in the case of composite quotations, such as those to which Dr. Hatch refers, or Messianic prophecies such as Dr. Drummond speaks of, but in the survival of a number of early Christian books, which are hardly more than strings of Anti-Jewish texts with editorial connexions and arrangements. We are not limited to a search in the pages of early Christian polemists, such as Justin or Irenaeus, though, as we shall show presently, there is abundance of fragmentary matter in their writings which can best be explained by the use of a book of Testimonies, and, indeed, in such a case as that of Justin, whose largest and most important work is a debate, real or imaginary, with a Jewish Rabbi, it would be strange indeed if Justin did not use the method of Testimonies, while the rest of the Church used them freely. It is not, however, a question of isolating quotations and reconstructing the books from which they were taken. There are a number of such books actually extant, which, when read side by side, show, from their common matter and method, and from their curious and minute agreements, that they constitute the very cycle of literature which we have been speaking of under the name of *Testimonies*; that is, they are definite books of polemic, closely connected one with

the others, and bearing marks of derivation from a common original.

In the case of a writer who uses Testimonies freely we may find ourselves in a difficulty as to whether he should be classed with Patristic writers, like Justin, who use Testimonies, but only in the course of an argument, or whether he should be grouped with Cyprian and others, to whom the Testimonies are the argument itself and not mere incidents in the course of it. But this is only a question of degree. All writers who can be convicted of the use of a Testimony book will be in evidence for the reconstruction of that book, in one or other of the phases of its evolution.

We have already alluded to the case of Cyprian, and from the distinction drawn above, if it could be maintained, between those who quote and those who merely edit or transcribe such books, we should be led to say that there are, from that point of view, two Cyprians; one who uses a book of Testimonies like Justin, for incidental polemic, and the other who makes, on his own account, an edition of the book with expansions and changes from his own editorial hand. The first may conveniently be neglected, at all events for the present. The second is one of our prime authorities.

Cyprian's Testimonies contain an earlier collection of Testimonies against the Jews.

A reference to the complete works of Cyprian will show a work in three books, addressed to a certain Quirinus, and headed with the title *Testimonia*. Of these the third book is concerned with Christian ethics and is clearly a later addition to the other two. But the first two books have a common preface in which Cyprian explains to Quirinus that he has put together two little tracts, one to show that the Jews, according to prophecy, have lost the Divine

favour and that the Christians have stepped into their place ; and the other to show that Christ was and is, what the Scripture foretold Him to be. And the direct attack upon the Jews in the first book, followed by the appeal to them which is involved in the prophecies (from the Old Testament) of the second book, is sufficient to permit us to re-write the title of Cyprian's book from the simple form *Testimonia* into the form *Testimonia adversus Judaeos* ; or, at all events, to regard the longer title as latent in the shorter.

We shall have to refer constantly to these two books in the course of our investigation, both to the actual quotations made, and to the heads under which they are grouped. No one will doubt that we have rightly described the books if he will read the capitulations, beginning with the statement that

The Jews have gravely offended God,
and concluding with the affirmation that
The Gentiles who believe are more than the Jews,
and that

The Jews can only obtain forgiveness by admission to the Christian Church.

There can be no doubt that in Cyprian's writings we have preserved a book of Testimonies against the Jews.

Tertullian against the Jews is a mass of Quotations, probably from an early Book of Testimonies.

A somewhat similar case will be the tract ascribed to Tertullian, which goes under the name of *Tertullian adversus Judaeos*. We shall be able, quite easily, to show the book of Testimonies underlying this tract of Tertullian ; the matter is, however, somewhat complicated by critical questions which have arisen as to the unity of the authorship of the work. It is, however, generally conceded that

the first eight chapters are from Tertullian's hand, and that the remainder is largely made up out of his other writings (possibly by the expansion of a later and less-skilled hand).

The book opens out for us a vista in another direction. We are told in the preface that it arose out of an unsatisfactory and inconclusive public debate between a Christian (Tertullian himself ?) and a Jewish proselyte ; and that it was an attempt to clear up the matters in dispute between them. Now there is a whole region of Christian literature, most of it unhappily lost, which was made up of dialogues between real or imaginary Christian and Jewish debaters ; and we may take it for granted that many of the proof-texts which we find in the book of Testimonies will appear also in such dialogues as those of Jason and Papiscus, Simon and Theophilus, Aquila and Timothy ; and that these works and similar ones, when extant, will be in evidence for the restoration which we are trying to make. In reality, however, they constitute a cycle of their own, and should be treated separately.

The case of Tertullian against the Jews does not properly belong with them, as it is not cast in the form of a dialogue, and follows closely the lines of the collectors of *Testimonia*. And it will be sufficient here to state that it will be found very useful in determining the contents and defining the antiquity of the early *Testimonia*.

Gregory of Nyssa is credited with a Book of Testimonies against the Jews.

A third and most important collection is one which passes under the name of Gregory of Nyssa, and which was published by Zacagni in his *Collectanea Sacra*. Whether the ascription of authorship is rightly made may be a difficult matter to decide. For, as soon as we have agreed that the

excerpts which make up the collection are conventional and traditional, we have very little to test the authorship by ; in so far as they are excerpts, we have Gregory of Nyssa as an editor and not as an author. In that case only the headings will tell us of the authorship ; we have not, as in Cyprian's case, the guidance or confirmation which comes from the fact of the collection being in Old Latin. But, on the other hand, if the matter be traditional and the parallels can be found all over the first three centuries, there is no reason why the ascription to Gregory of Nyssa should be false. What possible motive can be assigned for such an ascription of authorship, except that the book was found amongst his writings ; and if it was thus found, it is not impossible that it may have had his editorial care, just as did the Cyprianic collection ? However, it does not really matter whose collection it is, and we can cite it as Gregory of Nyssa without any prejudice to the question of ultimate authorship. We shall find many features in the work which are certainly of high antiquity and can be paralleled from the fathers of the first three centuries.

Hippolytus and Others.

A fourth work to which we may refer is a *Demonstration against the Jews* ('Αποδεικτικὴ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους) which is current under the name of Hippolytus, and was published by Lagarde amongst the works of that father. A fifth work would be the tract against the Jews in the writings of Cyprian. And many other early Patristic writers will be found to be more or less occupied in a similar use of material collected from the Old Testament.

Bar Ṣalibi Against the Jews.

And last of all we come to the treatise of Bar Ṣalibi *Against the Jews*, to which we referred in a recent issue of

the EXPOSITOR,¹ which, though late in date, contains many relics of the earlier controversies, and probably whole sections, slightly disguised in their transference into Syriac, of the lost book that we are in quest of. We have no need to apologize for Bar Ṣalibi's late date, relatively to such writers as Tertullian, Cyprian or Hippolytus. It is recognized that the writings of Bar Ṣalibi contain a great deal of early matter. We have not only had to thank him for his share in the vindication of the Diatessaron of Tatian and of Ephrem's commentary upon it, but we have also had his evidence for the reality of the Gaius with whom Hippolytus disputed (though Lightfoot made Gaius into a shadow of Hippolytus himself) and for a number of valuable extracts from the lost book against Gaius, to say nothing of the proof which he furnished that the celebrated Canon of Muratori was a fragment from that very book. Bar Ṣalibi must have had an excellent library of early fathers at his disposal, and it is very likely that more will yet be found of lost Christian authors in his pages.

This new tract, then, of Bar Ṣalibi can easily be proved to belong to the same cycle as the other books of which we have been speaking. We will now show how the conjecture of the critics, and the evidence of the extant literature as to the existence of early books of Testimonies can be confirmed by the internal evidence of the books referred to, including, of course, Bar Ṣalibi himself.

Evidence for Books of Testimonies.

Probably the best way to arrange the internal evidence which the extant books of Testimonies and the early Christian writers furnish for the construction of a lost original document or documents, would be to arrange the matter under some such scheme as the following :

¹ EXPOSITOR (N.S.), xii. 161.

Peculiar Texts.

(a) We should carefully note the recurrence of those various readings which appear to be unique in such collections and such arguments as we have been alluding to.

Recurrent Sequences.

(b) We should carefully study the sequence of the passages which are adduced in the same collections and arguments. We shall find that sequences recur, just as readings do.

Erroneous Authorship.

(c) We shall also find that there is a recurrence of erroneous ascriptions of authorship, by which a wrong title is assigned to a passage taken from the Old Testament.

Editor's Prefaces, Comments and Questions.

(d) We shall find a recurrence of introductory or explanatory clauses which betray the hand of an editor or collector, and of which not a few belong to the very first strata of the deposited testimonies.

Matter for the use of the Controversionalist.

(e) We shall find that these explanatory and introductory clauses are often of the nature of direct challenges such as would be made in a debate, or would be considered as applicable to the person or persons for whom the book is intended.

Now let us give some instances that will come under these various heads, without attempting to follow a strict logical order ; and we shall readily illustrate the arguments that must have been involved in the conventional oral or written statements which the early Christians made to the Jews with whom they were contending ; and it will soon become as clear as daylight that the major part of the testimonies in question were not limited to oral circulation, but that they were extant in book form.

Suppose, for example, we were reading the following passage in Irenaeus ¹ relating to certain prophecies about our Lord :

Qui autem dicunt, adventu ejus quemadmodum cervus claudus saliet, et plana erit lingua mutorum et aperientur oculi caecorum, et aures surdorum audient, et manus dissolutae, et genua debilia firmabuntur ; et, resurgent qui in monumento sunt mortui, et ipse infirmitates nostras accipiet et languores portabit, eas quae ab eo curationes fiebant annuntiaverunt :

and if we were to place side by side with this the following passage from Justin's *First Apology* : ²

Ὅτι δὲ καὶ θεραπεύσειν πάσας νόσους καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνεγερῆν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε τῶν λελεγμένων. ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα. Τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλείται χωλὸς ὡς ἔλαφος καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάων· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέψουσι καὶ λεπροὶ καθαρισθήσονται καὶ νεκροὶ ἀναστήσονται καὶ περιπατήσουσιν·

we should at once see that both Justin and Irenaeus have added an introductory formula to the quotation which they make from Isaiah xxxv, and this introductory formula, "at his advent," ought to have been italicized in Irenaeus as a part of the quotation ; in other words, ³it is not, in either case, an immediate quotation from Isaiah, but a quotation from a book containing testimonies of Isaiah and others. For no one will for a moment assume that Irenaeus went to Justin's writings in search of the introductory formula. He found it attached to his prophecies, as Justin did. The words had been substituted for the introductory "then" in "then shall the lame man leap, etc.," as if a question had been asked and answered with regard to the time implied by the prophet. The answer itself is due to the previous sentence (Isa. xxxv. 4), "Your God will come . . . He will come and save you."

¹ Lib. iv. 55. 2: ed. Mass. 273.

² 1 Ap. 48.

Moreover we have with the quotation a decided suggestion that the prophecies quoted were grouped under heads, and we can come near to the restoration of one such formula. For when Irenaeus introduces the matter, he does it by a statement that "those who say thus and thus. . . . announced the cures which were done by him (sc. Christ)." And Justin says, "Now that he was to heal diseases and to raise the dead may be seen from the following prophecies." Looking back to Irenaeus' quotation we see that he also has the raising of the dead along with the cures, though he does not use the same proof-text ; and on turning to another chapter of the Apology of Justin, (c. 54), we find the complaint made that when the heathen "learnt that it was foretold that he should *heal diseases and raise the dead*, they dragged in Asklepius," to explain the facts. Here again we catch the refrain of the introductory formula, "That it was foretold of Christ that He should heal diseases, etc."

Last of all, we notice that the quotation of Irenaeus is a series of extracts or testimonies. It is a composite quotation. He begins with Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6, goes on with Isaiah xxvi. 19, and concludes with Isaiah liii. 4 ; this is just what we should expect from a collection of Testimonies. And we conclude, therefore, that both Irenaeus and Justin had access to such a collection and probably it was a part of their Christian education to know such a book.

Now let us try a somewhat similar passage from Irenaeus of which we have the Greek preserved. In the third volume of the Oxyrhyncus papyri, Grenfell and Hunt gave a series of seven fragments from an unknown Christian writer, with the interesting statement that the fragments might be as old as the second century. These fragments were promptly identified by Dr. Armitage Robinson as containing portions of the lost Greek text of Irenaeus, and with the aid of the extant Latin he restored very skilfully

the order and completed the contents of the passages involved in the torn fragments of papyrus. Amongst his restorations one passage corresponding to the Latin of Irenaeus, Bk. iii. c. 9, ran as follows : a few letters in each line being the key to the passage :

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | οὗ καὶ τὸ ἀ- | i.e., of whose star |
| στρον Βαλαάμ μὲν οὖ] | τωίς ἐ | Balaam prophesied |
| προφήτευσεν Ἀνατε] | λ[εῖ ἃ | as follows : There |
| στρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ . . .] | | shall rise a star. |
| | | out of Jacob, etc. |

To this restoration I took exception on two grounds : (1) that the Clermont and Vossian copies of Irenaeus read in the Latin, not Balaam, but *Isaiah* ; (2) that the same mistake of crediting Isaiah with a passage from Numbers was made in the following passage of Justin (i. *Apol.* c. 32).

καὶ Ἡσαίας δὲ ἄλλος προφήτης τὰ αὐτὰ δι' ἄλλων ῥήσεων προφητεύων, οὕτως εἶπεν· Ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ καὶ ἄνθος ἀναβήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς ρίζης Ἰεσσαὶ, κτλ.

From this passage we see how the error of placing the name of Isaiah on a prophecy of Balaam arose ; for Justin shows us the passage of Isaiah following the one from Numbers, and the error lies in the covering of two passages with a single reference. It is clear, then, that Justin's mistake was made in a collection of Testimonies from the prophets, and that the same collection, or one that closely agreed with it, was in the hands of Irenaeus. We have thus confirmed our results in a previous case, and can proceed with confidence, assuming not only the existence, but also the extreme antiquity of the collections referred to.

We have now illustrated the recurrence of quotations in a given sequence and the displacement of the names of prophets quoted, to which we referred above as furnishing the internal tests for the use of Testimony books.

As the field of criticism, which is thus opened up, is very wide, and the suspicion arises in our minds that there is matter of the same kind in the New Testament itself, it will be worth our while to give a few illustrations more, by which we may confirm the external and internal evidence for the lost books and tracts of which we are speaking. There is a remarkable reading, apparently from the Greek Psalter, which has perplexed the souls of many critics who have set themselves to find either the authority for the reading or an explanation of its genesis. I refer to the famous passage in which the early Fathers speak of Christ under the terms, "The Lord reigned from the tree," a passage which has in recent times provoked an ingenious (but, I am afraid, impossible) Rabbinic explanation by Mr. Hart in the pages of the EXPOSITOR.

† Of the antiquity of the text there can be no doubt; it is certainly earlier than Justin, and it would not require a very acute imagination to suggest that it was involved in the argument of St. Peter with the Jewish rulers in Acts v. 30, 31, where we are told that—

"Ye slew Him and nailed Him to the tree;
Him hath God exalted a Prince and a Saviour."

But whether it is involved in the text of Acts or not, it is well known that it is one of the passages which Justin accused the men of the Synagogue of having erased from the Biblical text; that is, it was an obvious *argumentum ad Judaeum*. We make the suggestion that the passage never occurred in any MSS. of the LXX., but that Justin took it from a book of Testimonies. He introduces it as being from the 95th Psalm¹; which suggests either a reference to the Psalter or to a book of extracts which introduced a sentence something in the following manner:

¹ Justin, *Dial.* 72.

David in the 95th Psalm : " Say among the heathen, the Lord reigned from the tree."

According to Justin the last three words had been removed from the LXX. by the Jews. Is this a mere guess on Justin's part ? Let us see if we can get any light on the matter.

The next writer who quotes the passage is, I think, Tertullian *Against the Jews* (c. 10) ; we have already alluded to this tract as containing many of the earliest testimonies employed by the Christians of the first two centuries. He introduces it, along with many other references to the Cross and Passion, as follows :

" Age dum, si legisti penes Prophetam in psalmis, *Deus regnavit a ligno* : expecto quid intelligas," etc.

This is thoroughly in the manner of the controversialist, and suggests the use of a conventional method. The debater asks his opponent what he makes of this text. Can we find confirmation for the suggestion that we are dealing with formal matter definitely arranged ? I think we can.

The passage quoted from Justin is only one out of a number of texts which he says the Jews have altered. Curiously they all belong to the same category, viz., prophecies of the Cross and Passion. The one which precedes this one that we are discussing is the well known statement that the Jews have removed (though it is still to be found in some copies) a passage in which Jeremiah said, " Come let us put wood on His bread," the wood being assumed to be the Cross. Now this is quoted in the Testimonies of Gregory of Nyssa in the following form :

Ἰερεμίας. Ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ἀρνίον ἄκακον ἀγόμενον τοῦ θύεσθαι, οὐκ ἔγνω.

καὶ πάλιν. Δεῦτε καὶ ἐμβαλῶμεν ξύλον εἰς τὸν ἄρτον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκτρίψωμεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ζώντων καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ μνησθῇ ἔτι.

If with this we compare the quotation of the same passage by Bar Ṣalibi (p. 33), we have as follows :

And Jeremiah : And I was like an innocent lamb that is led to the slaughter, and I did not know what was over me.¹ And come let us corrupt (?) wood on his bread.²

Here two separate collections of Testimonies make the very same sequence of supposed passages from Jeremiah, and it is clear that they reflect a primitive arrangement and ascription of the peculiar words. But this ascription is Justin's, and it seems to be probable that Justin was using his Testimony-book, and not his copy of the Septuagint, when he talked about "the wood and the bread." If this is likely for one of the passages which the Jews are said to have altered, then, since they all deal with the subject of the Cross, they probably were all taken from a book of prophecies which had been fulfilled, arranged under various heads. In that case, Justin's reference to the Jews as destroying or removing texts is gratuitous. And that it is so is clear in the case of "the wood and the bread" from the fact that all copies of Jeremiah have the disputed reading in Jeremiah xi. 19. If Justin had looked at any Greek copy of Jeremiah, he would have found it ; but he looked instead at the Testimony-book, and assumed that it was absent from Jeremiah (unless in a few cases it had escaped correction).

The development of pertinent questions in connexion with prophetical quotations is a subject that covers a great deal of ground. It is clear that many of these questions

¹ A reference to p. 23, where the passage is quoted again, suggests that this should read, "And I did not know : and against me [they devised devices] and said, Come, let us corrupt his bread on the wood." That is, some words have dropped on p. 33, and a slight transposition has been made on p. 23, the existence of a common original for the two quotations is sufficiently evident.

² Both of the passages are in Cyprian, *Test.* ii. 15, and the second of the two passages is in Cyprian, *Test.* ii. 20.

belong to the very earliest form of the Testimony-book. For example, when we read in Irenaeus (lib. iv. c. 10) as follows :

Jam¹ autem et manifestaverat [sc. Moyses] ejus adventum dicens : *Non deerit princeps in Juda, neque dux ex femoribus ejus, quoadusque veniat cui repositum est, et ipse est spes gentium ; alligans ad vitem pullum et ad helicem pullum asinae. Lavabit in vino stolam et in sanguine uvae pallium suum ; lactifici oculi ejus a vino et candidi dentes ejus quam lac.* Inquirant enim hi qui omnia scrutari dicuntur, id tempus in quo defecit princeps et dux ex Juda :

we have one of the greatest of the Messianic proof texts, accompanied by a question as to when the ruler failed from the line of Judah. Suppose now we turn to Justin's *First Apology* (c. 32) ; here we are told as follows :

Μωύσης Ἰμὲν οὖν, πρῶτος τῶν προφητῶν γενόμενος εἶπεν αὐτολέξει οὕτως. Οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ἰούδα οὐδὲ ἡγούμενος ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀποκεῖται καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ, πλύνων ἐν αἵματι σταφυλῆς τὴν στολὴν αὐτοῦ. Ὑμέτερον οὖν ἐστὶν ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσαι καὶ μαθεῖν, μέχρι τινὸς ἦν ἄρχων καὶ βασιλεὺς ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ ἰδιος αὐτῶν.

Here we have substantially the same quotation, followed by a similar inquiry ; the connexion between the two statements is further established by the curious coincidence that both writers refer the quotation to Moses, and not to Jacob.¹

The coincidences are such that we are entitled to say that the early Testimony-book referred the prophecy of Jacob to Moses, and accompanied it by a pertinent query. And many similar conjunctions can be noted. Perhaps the most important of them from a theological point of view may be found in the treatment to which a certain

¹ So in Justin, i. *Apol.* c. 54, the Messianic prophecy is again referred to Moses. But in *Dial.* 54 he explains that the passages are recorded by Moses, but prophesied by Jacob: ὑπὸ Μωυσέως ἀνιστορημένον καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἰακώβ προπεφητευμένον.

verse from the 110th Psalm was subjected, and the questions that were asked in connexion with it. When one reads the history of the great Council of Nicaea for the first time, the feeling of impressiveness which is provoked by the historical scene and by the greatness of its theme of debate is tempered by astonishment at the inadequacy of many of the arguments which are brought forward, and with the utmost seriousness considered, with a view to the determination of the proper language in which to clothe the doctrine of the Sonship of Jesus Christ. With a subject for discourse such as for sacredness and high solemnity has never been equalled in the history of human thought, and with a congress of intellects involving at least two or three religious teachers whose capacity far outreaches the average human span, it is surprising that the issue of the great contest should turn so much on misinterpreted texts and overstrained similitudes. It almost seems as if the combatants were giants and children by turns, or as if they held briefs to reproduce not only the loftiest thoughts of the teachers of the Church in earlier ages, but also their weakest suggestions along with the chatter of the baths and of the bakers' shops. What are we to make of Athanasius when he uses, to determine the language of the Church's symbol of Faith, a verse from the 110th Psalm, in which we read in the Greek version :

πρὸ ἑωσφόρου γεγέννηκά σε.

(Before the day-star I begat thee.)

It seems almost inconceivable that so much can have been made of a misinterpreted and mistranslated text. Yet no one seems to have questioned that the passage was germane to the discussion : the only question was as to the extent to which the Church was committed by its assumed oracle. No one questioned the accuracy of the Septuagint read-

ing, nor its applicability to either the Homooousion or the Homoiousion doctrine.

When, however, we succeed, however imperfectly, in transferring ourselves into the fourth century so as to be able to look both up stream and down stream at the flowing doctrine of the Church, we can see that the very fact of the influence of the passage quoted proves that it was not quoted for the first time at the Council of Nicaea. It was a well known interpretation before the days of Athanasius, Eusebius and Arius. We can easily show that from the very earliest time this text had suffered violence, and violent men had perverted its meaning; but the most ill-proportioned things may often be set in surroundings where they can acquire a certain amount of dignity, and perhaps it was not wholly inept that the orthodox brained Arius (or tried to) with a missile taken from the armoury of the primitive Christians against the Jews. We will now show that this is the origin of the passage in question.

Bar Šalibi in his Testimonies ¹ quotes as follows :

David said : Before the day-star I begat thee. And before the Sun is his name and before the moon. Now explain to us, when was Israel born before the day-star, etc.

Here the controversialist has put together two passages in order to prove the pre-existence of the Son and his eternity. At the same time he refutes the objector who says that this and similar things are said of Israel. The passages combined are from the 110th Psalm and from the 71st Psalm ; the objection met is that some other person or persons than the Messiah are referred to. Now turn to Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, c. 63, c. 76 and c. 83, and you will find him harping on the same text and meeting a similar objection. "Your Rabbis," says Justin, "have dared to refer the Psalm (cx.) to Hezekiah and not

¹ p. 28.

to Christ.” It follows that it was a controversial passage in Justin’s day : you can hear the two disputants at their work. The Rabbis of whom Justin was speaking were replying to Messianic and Christian interpretations. In another passage (c. 76) Justin combines the two passages from the Psalms as follows :

καὶ Δαβιδὸς δὲ πρὸ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης
ἐκ γαστρὸς γεννηθήσεσθαι αὐτὸν κατὰ
τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλὴν ἐκήρυξε·

where it is easy to see the combined fragments of—

Before the day-star I begat thee from the womb ;
Before the sun and before the moon His name shall abide.

The same blending of passages is found in c. 45, where Justin speaks of Christ as being “ before the day-star and the moon.”

But if we want further confirmation that the two passages belong to a combination in a book of Testimonies, here it is in a very primitive form from Gregory of Nyssa : ¹

ἡ δὴλον πρὸς ὃν εἶπεν, ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγεννησά σε· καὶ, πρὸ τοῦ ἡλίου τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ πρὸ τῆς σελήνης.

And here we have the primitive question “Of whom speaketh the prophet this ? ” in a form which at once explains why later editors proved that it was not Hezekiah, nor the ideal Israel. It looks as if the form in Gregory of Nyssa were very near to the original.²

However, we have shown that the force of Athanasius’ argument lay in the fact that he was quoting from the old Book of Testimonies ; for we not only find his proof-text in Justin and elsewhere, but in two extant books of such prophetic evidence. And it will be seen that the collection of Bar Ṣalibi has much ancient material incorporated in it.

¹ Zacagni, p. 292.

² Cyprian, *Test.* i. 17, has merely Ps. cix. Ante luciferum genui te. Juravit Dominus, etc.

Perhaps enough has now been said to demonstrate the existence of the lost book whose influence the critics have been suspecting.

As soon as we have accumulated enough evidence to enable us to definitely state the existence of the primitive Testimony-book, we can go to use the recovered book for the criticism of the early Patristic documents, and of the books of the New Testament. We will first give a specimen of the way in which the book can be traced in a sub-apostolic writer. Suppose, for example, that we were studying the so-called second epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. We find that as soon as the prologue is over, the second chapter plunges abruptly into a quotation from the beginning of Isaiah liv., "Rejoice, barren woman, that dost not bear," a passage with which we are familiar from its use in the Epistle to the Galatians. He proceeds to explain the application of the passage to the Church and the Synagogue, and continues thus: "In saying that the children of the desolate are more than of her that hath the husband, he was speaking to prove that our people seemed desolate and forsaken of God, whereas now we have believed and have become more than those who seemed to know God." Now turn to Justin's *First Apology*, c. 53, and you will find him making a similar statement from the same passage: "We know," he says, "that the Christians from among the Gentiles are more and truer than the Jews and the Samaritans." "It was prophesied that believers from among the Gentiles should be more in number than those who come from among the Jews and Samaritans. For it was said as follows: Rejoice, thou barren woman, etc. . . . And that the converts from the Gentiles should be truer and trustier, we will declare by quoting the words of Isaiah the prophet." Then he proceeds to quote, not Isaiah, but Jeremiah (Jer. ix. 26), to the effect that Israel is uncircum-

cised in heart, the Gentiles are ceremonially uncircumcised." The same argument from prophecy appears in c. 31, where he tells us that it was foretold that the messengers of the Gospel should be sent to every race of men, and that the Gentiles should believe rather than the Jews. Now here we have all the features of the use of the Testimony-book. And when we turn to the Testimonies of Cyprian we find as follows :

Quod Ecclesia quae prius sterilis fuerat plures filios habitura esset ex gentibus, quam quot synagoga ante habuisset.

This heading is followed by another :

Quod gentes magis in Christum crediturae essent.

Here we have the very points made by Justin and Ps.-Clement ; the Gentiles more, truer and trustier ; and the first proof-text is—

Apud Esaïam prophetam : Laetare, sterilis, etc.

It is needless to say more ; the evidence is conclusive that the early book of Testimonies contained a section on the numerical and ethical superiority of Gentile Christians to Jews (or is it Judæo-Christians ?). And from the way in which the supposed Clement plunges at once into the use of the book, we may be sure that it was familiar to him, and that it was not wholly unknown to his hearers.

The question that comes next is the possibility of our finding traces of the Testimony-book in the pages of the New Testament. The subject is suggested by the previous one which we were discussing from Ps.-Clement, where a passage is quoted which we also find used as a testimony in the Epistle to the Galatians (iv. 17). It is also suggested by the fact that we find an occasional failure of the references to the Old Testament on the side of authorship, as when Mark refers to Isaiah a prophecy of Malachi ; and Matthew refers to Jeremiah a well-known passage about the potter's

field ; besides these and similar errors we have curious features in the quotations of the Fourth Gospel which suggest composite quotation. We should also examine the sequence of the prophecies quoted in the New Testament in order to see whether they agree with the sequences in the Testimony-book, and we must try in such cases to find out which of the books has borrowed from the other.

For example, when Peter (1 Ep. ii. 6-8) says :

“ Behold I lay in Zion an elect corner-stone, etc.” ;

“ He that believeth on Him shall not be confounded ” ;

“ The stone which the builders [rejected is become the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence ” ;

we have a sequence of quotations from

Isa. xxviii. [16, Ps. cxviii. 22, Isa. viii. 14, the connexion between them being the word “ Stone ” as applied to Christ.

If we turn to Romans ix. 32, 33, we have the statement that

“ They stumbled at the stumbling stone, as it is written : Behold I lay in Sion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded ” ;

where the sequence is Isaiah viii. 14, Isaiah xxviii. 16, the two passages being neatly incorporated into an apparently single reference. The suggestion arises that the Testimony-book had made the conjunction ; and in that case the headline must have been a statement that Christ is the stumbling stone, or something that would lead up to that. The anti-Judaic character of the quotation does not need to be stated. Did the Testimony-books use this figure and the corresponding quotations ? The answer is that it would take a whole chapter to illustrate the way in which the earliest of the fathers harp upon the statement that Christ is called the Stone in the Scriptures. When we turn to Cyprian’s *Testimonia* (ii. 16) we find a section headed—

Quod idem et lapis dictus sit

followed by a section (ii. 17)—

Quod deinde idem lapis mons fieret et impleret totam terram.

The first section begins with the first passage from Isaiah as in 1 Peter, and goes on to Psalm cxvii. ; but does not incorporate the second passage of Isaiah. The same references with the same omission will be found in Greg. Nyss., p. 312. The inference is that the treatment in Cyprian is conventional, and goes back to an early original. The verification of this is in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, where Justin returns again and again to the statement that Christ is the Stone of the Old Testament, e.g. :

c. 34. "I am going to show you from all the Scriptures that Christ is King and Lord and Priest and God and angel and man and general and *stone*, and the child that is born, and that he comes first to suffer (*παθης*) and then returns, etc."

Amongst the proofs which Justin brings will be found agreements with Cyprian that Christ is the stone which Jacob anointed at Bethel, etc. But, as I have said, it would make a long chapter to trace the doctrine that Christ is the Stone.¹ The history of the doctrine begins with the Lord's own use of the passage from the Psalm as an anti-Judaic testimony and was carried on and marvellously developed for two hundred years. It was certainly a leading point in the Testimony-book.

We ought also to examine whether there are in the New Testament traces of the matter and manner of the controversialist, as we find him in our study of Anti-Judaism elsewhere. A simple instance will show what we mean.

In Acts xxvi. 23, Paul's speech before Agrippa contains the following statement ; first, that he says nothing outside of what the prophets and Moses have said ; second, he

¹ For Justin, *Dial.*, see further 70, 76, 86, 100.

indicates in the following curious expression the matters to be discussed :

εἰ παθὴτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

No one, as far as I know, has succeeded in translating this sentence.¹ It is clearly interrogative : "Does the Messiah suffer, and does he first rise from the dead, etc." The words are headlines of testimonies, awkwardly incorporated in the text, and are betrayed as such by the previous references to the prophets and Moses, who are to answer the questions. And a reference to the previous quotation which we took from Justin, as to the things which he was going to prove from the Scriptures (in particular that Christ was the Stone) will show that he also proposed to demonstrate that Christ was *παθητός*. It is the same term as in the Acts, and means that the Messiah must suffer (*ἔδει παθεῖν*).²

We suggest, therefore, that this passage of the Acts shows the influence of the Testimony-book. But now we are on the edge of some large and difficult questions, for the treatment of which our present space will not suffice ; and we must be content to leave the matter for ampler investigation by others, in the hope that the newly published text of Bar Ṣalibi will assist us in the solution of the intricate and interesting questions which have been raised briefly in these pages.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

¹ The R.V. margin comes nearest to it, with the suggestion "Whether" for *εἰ*.

² Not "is capable of suffering," as in R.V. margin.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XVI. THE FORESHADOWINGS OF THE CROSS.

(1) IN the *Fourth Study* of this series, dealing with Jesus' acceptance of His vocation at His Baptism the conclusion was stated "that the vocation He was conscious of, and accepted, was that of a Saviour from sin by the sacrifice of Himself." In support of this conclusion it was argued that Jesus derived His ideal of the Messiahship from the *Servant of Jehovah*; that He fulfilled all righteousness in accepting the task of justifying many by bearing their iniquities; that the words ascribed to the Baptist regarding the Lamb of God were an echo of the communication Jesus had made to him. This does not mean, of course, that Jesus had a full and clear anticipation of all that the Passion would involve, that at all times His mind was occupied with His sacrifice, that the dark and drear shadow of the future blotted out the sunshine of the present; but it does mean that, although He was divinely guided step by step along the path of His ministry, Himself not knowing always what the way would be, yet He had a distinct prevision whither His Father was guiding Him; that, while He was made glad by the faith, and even surprised by the unbelief, of men, He was steadfastly recognizing that His ministry was not destined to end in any earthly success, or worldly triumph; that, although in His emotions varying notes of joy or grief were struck by the changeful experiences of His life among men, yet the undertone was the sense of a great good to be gained by the endurance of a great sorrow. For the sake of His disciples He exercised a restraint over His utterances, and His first disclosure to them should not be regarded as coinciding with His first discovery of the lot that was assigned to Him. There are obscure references,

which seem to have made no impression on the disciples, but which show that the expectation of His sacrifice was a constant element in His "inner life."

(2) In dealing in the *Eighth Study* with Jesus' challenge to the priesthood, "Destroy this temple," and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii. 19), the writer ventured to express a doubt of the correctness of the evangelist's interpretation, "he spake of the temple of his body" (ver. 21), and to suggest that in these words Jesus expressed His confidence that He could restore the religion that was being ruined by the priesthood. Further reflection has presented at least the possibility that, as Jesus afterwards so distinctly and emphatically connected the doom of Jerusalem with His own death as the Divine judgment on the human crime, He may even at this time have connected the overthrow of the temple which He here announces with the passion which He anticipated for Himself; and without going beyond the prophecy of the *Servant of Jehovah* He may have confidently expected His own triumph after His passion. "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong" (Isa. liii. 12).

(3) In the same *Study* it was maintained that the conversation with Nicodemus (John iii.) probably closed with verse 12 or even verse 10, and that it was very unlikely that verse 14, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up," could have been uttered to so unprepared and unsympathetic a hearer. This was regarded as a reflection of the Evangelists. To this assumption one objection, however, must now be noted. The term *Son of Man* is not used by the Evangelists of Jesus, but only by Himself. It is possible then that we have here a genuine *logion* of Jesus, which the Evangelist has woven into his own reflections. When or why it was

uttered we have no means of discovering. If it belonged to as early a period in Jesus' ministry as is here assigned to it, then it would indicate that the mind of Jesus was dwelling on the necessity of His death, and that by meditation on such analogies as the Old Testament presented, He was seeking the comfort that the assurance of its beneficent purpose could afford. But we cannot here go beyond a mere conjecture.

(4) A passage in regard to which there is no such obscurity is Jesus' answer to the censure of His disciples because they did not fast. "Can the sons of the bridechamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast" (Matt. ix. 15; cf. Mark ii. 19, 20, Luke v. 34, 35). In regard to this utterance two points deserve special notice.

In the *Eleventh Study on The Companionship of the Twelve* attention has already been called to the light which this utterance casts on the relationship of Jesus to His disciples. It was one of deep affection, close communion, and, at this time at least, entire satisfaction. Fasting would have been altogether inappropriate for them, as their mood was so joyous. Of the parting Jesus Himself anticipated they had as yet no expectation. He did not betray to them any sorrow He may have felt; but communicated to them a contagious joy. Probably He Himself at this period dwelt on "the joy that was set before him," Nevertheless this saying does reveal a very real element in His anticipated passion. It would involve His severance from those to whom He was very dear, and who for the good of their life had great need of Him. The shadow that fell over Him would then fall, even more drear, on them; and the sorrow that would come on them added weight to the burden that rested on Him. The circumstances of the utterance

are also significant. The criticism, against which He was defending His disciples, revealed an antagonism between His spirit and the traditions and customs of Judaism which could end only in mutual injury. It now became clearer to Jesus than it had been before in what way His sacrifice would be brought about. The figurative sayings about the new patch on the old garment, and the new wine in the old wine skins, are prophetic. His passion would be judgment to Judaism; a worse rent would be made in the garment; even as the wine would be spilled, so the wine-skins would be burst.

(5) An allusion to the value of His death is very distinctly made in John vi. 51: "I am the living bread which came down out of heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." It is very difficult, however, to accept this saying in its present form as an authentic utterance of Jesus. The difference between the Synoptic and Johannine discourses is often explained as due to difference of audience, the multitude in Galilee in the one case, or of the scribes of Jerusalem in the other; but this explanation is impossible here. This discourse is represented as addressed to the people that had been fed miraculously on the shores of the lake. Its contents are so unlike anything to be found in the Synoptic reports of the Galilean ministry, and resemble so closely later developments of doctrine, that while single sayings may be reminiscences, the development of the ideas suggested by them must be regarded as due to the reflection of the Evangelist. Is it at all probable that before Jesus had made any communication to His disciples about His passion, He should have referred thus to the value of His sacrifice in public utterance? Although *Westcott* maintains that the thought "is concentrated upon the Incarnation and its consequences generally,"

yet he does recognize that as regards the term "flesh" which "describes human nature in its totality regarded from its earthly side"—"the thought of death lies already in the word, but that thought is not as yet brought out, as afterwards, by the addition of *blood*." Commenting on verse 53 he says "the 'flesh' is presented in its twofold aspect as 'flesh' and 'blood,' and by this separation of its parts a violent death is presupposed." "By the 'flesh,' " he continues, "we must understand the virtue of Christ's humanity as living for us; by the 'blood' the virtue of His humanity as subject to death" (*Gospel of St. John*, pp. 106, 107). The subtleties of this commentary surely confirm the conviction that it was not thus Jesus taught the common people.

(6) The last two paragraphs of this chapter in the Fourth Gospel (verses 60 to 64, and 66 to 71) also raise a serious problem. The Synoptists do not give any distinct indication that any so serious crisis immediately followed the feeding of the five thousand. That an attempt may have been made by the multitude to compel Jesus to assume the rôle of political Messiah, as verse 15 indicates, is not in itself improbable; not more improbable is it that the attempt had the sympathy and the support of the disciples. His refusal would produce wide-spread disappointment, and even deep-rooted resentment; and to this the reference may be made in these passages. The Synoptic record represents Jesus as seeking after this incident more and more to withdraw Himself and His disciples from the multitude, and this course may have been due to His desire to escape popular antagonism as well as to His wish to instruct His disciples privately. We may conclude that the results of the feeding of the five thousand were such as to bring His passion appreciably nearer for His consciousness.

(7) The writer cannot, however, altogether rid himself of the impression that there are in these passages blended with memories of this crisis reminiscences of the later crisis at Cæsarea Philippi. Do not verses 68 and 69 sound like an echo of Peter's confession in Matthew xvi. 16? The difference can be explained by the substitution of the Johannine for the Synoptic vocabulary. If this be so, then Christ's detection of, and even allusion to, the part Judas was to play in the great tragedy may be traced back to this time. We must not suppose that Jesus foreknew Judas' betrayal when He called him to become a disciple: that assumption has intolerable moral difficulties; but we may suppose that with His insight into the moral and spiritual conditions of others, He discovered the beginnings of estrangement and treachery in Judas even before Judas himself was fully aware of his change of feeling and aim. In this sense we may accept the Evangelist's statement in verse 64, "For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray Him." Jesus' refusal of the Kingship would be the first blow to Judas' loyalty; the declaration of the approaching passion by Jesus would be the second. For we may suppose that this allusion to one of the twelve as a devil followed in the conversation at Cæsarea Philippi on the rebuke of Peter for his remonstrance. The first announcement did not contain any allusion to betrayal; and we may thence conclude that it was the announcement itself that precipitated Judas' resolve, and that Jesus at once discovered that resolve, and alluded to it in the second announcement. But we have been led to anticipate what must be more fully discussed afterwards. His passion Jesus foresaw would involve not only separation from His disciples, and the antagonism of Judaism, but also the treachery of one of His chosen companions. We cannot estimate how much

this anticipation increased the pain with which He looked forward to the sacrifice before Him.

(8) Before we can deal with the three announcements of the Passion recorded in the Synoptists we must seek an answer to several questions. The declarations are so brief that we cannot but ask ourselves whether very much has not been omitted by the evangelical tradition. The teaching of Jesus must surely have been very much more frequent and more varied, when He was seeking to persuade and constrain His disciples to acquiesce in a decision regarding His own future which so offended their prejudices and disappointed their ambitions. Is not the explanation of the meagreness of the tradition to be found in this antagonism of the disciples? Their hostility to this teaching led them either to pay very little attention to it, or to dismiss it from their minds as soon as possible. It is evident from the course of events that Jesus failed to produce any deep impression upon their minds. What to Him was of supreme importance they disregarded; and can we doubt that this growing estrangement of His disciples hurt Him sorely? If there is this reason to account for the omission of much of Jesus' teaching at this time on this theme, we are led on to another question: How did the disciples remember and transmit these definite announcements? It is easy to dismiss them as prophecy after the event. It is impossible to affirm confidently that the evangelical tradition has not been affected by the history of the Passion; that the memory of Christ's predictions has not been blended with the remembrance of His experience; but, on the other hand, we cannot confidently deny that Jesus foresaw the course of events, and in such definite announcements forewarned His disciples, that, whatever influence the history may have had in the present form of the prophecy, there was a distinct remembrance in the disciple

circle that such prophecy had been uttered. That, as we shall afterwards see, there is a growing definiteness in the three announcements shows either great literary art in the Evangelists, or, what is more probable, that real predictions were remembered as marked from time to time by this greater detail.

(9) How are we to conceive the mental process of which these statements were the results? We have abandoned the old conception of prophecy as history known beforehand; we have come to regard the foresight of the prophets as due to insight both regarding the Divine purposes to be fulfilled and the historical conditions under which the fulfilment was to take place. Thus Amos' foresight of the fate of the Northern Kingdom was due to his insight into the Divine purpose to execute judgment on the sins of the nation, and into the function of the rising Assyrian power in the fulfilment of the Divine intentions. If we are to maintain our belief in the reality of the Divine *Kenosis* in the Incarnation, we must conceive the predictions of Christ in the same way. He had an infallible insight into the Divine purpose in His personal vocation, the salvation of men from sin by the sacrifice of Himself. This insight, it has been maintained, He possessed from the beginning of His ministry. The means by which that sacrifice would be brought about were probably discovered by His insight into the course of events. His own experience brought Him enlightenment regarding the actual conditions under which the sacrifice would be offered. The growing definiteness of His successive announcements to His disciples would, if this surmise is correct, be due to His own advancing knowledge, and not be a pedagogic device to communicate gradually to His disciples, as they were able to receive, the details from the beginning familiar to Himself. That He must die, and that a speedy resurrection must follow His

death, seems to have been the primary certainty. As He watched the progress of the antagonism directed against Himself one feature after another in His passion was anticipated by Him, and communicated to His disciples. To recognize such progress in His realization of what His passion would involve seems to the writer to invest the evangelical record of these announcements with a deeper personal interest.

(10) The first announcement (Matt. xvi. 21 ; Mark viii. 31 ; Luke ix. 22) was made after the confession of Jesus' Messiahship by Peter at Cæsarea Philippi. In addition to the constant feature in the predictions—death and resurrection—this lays the emphasis on rejection by the elders, and the chief priests and scribes, the three classes who constituted the national authorities. Jesus had already during the course of His ministry had abundant evidence of the hostility of these influential persons. Hitherto His popularity with the multitude had offered Him some protection, but the account Peter had just given of the perplexity of the public opinion regarding His Person (Matt. xvi. 14, "Some say John the Baptist, some Elijah ; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets ") showed Jesus that when on His coming to Jerusalem He would make the formal claim of Messiahship, He could not rely on any popular support, and there would be no hindrance to His enemies doing their will in regard to Him. It is true one way of escape still seemed open. He could regain His popularity by lowering His ideal, and by meeting the expectations of the populace. Had He done that, whatever the ultimate issue might have been, for a time at least, elders, priests, and scribes might have been held at bay. The severity of Jesus' rebuke of Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan ; thou art a stumblingblock unto me ; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men " (Matt. xvi. 23),

indicates that He did Himself feel tempted to use some means of escape, whether this, as is probable, or some other we do not know of. It need not be assumed that Jesus already foresaw that the Cross would be His lot. His reference to the disciple's denying himself, taking up His cross, and following Him (ver. 24) may be proverbial ; or if not, Jesus was familiar enough with the Roman mode of execution to use one item in it as a vivid illustration of a general principle without our being compelled to assume that in using it He was thinking of the manner of His own death.

(11) The distinctive feature of the second announcement (Matt. xvii. 22-23 ; Mark ix. 31 ; Luke ix. 34) made on the return to Galilee after the Confession and the Transfiguration (an event which will be the subject of the next *Study*), is in the words, "The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men." The statement seems to allow three interpretations. First it may be the surrender of the Divine Son by the Divine Father to His human persecutors and enemies that is referred to. The phrase "into the hands of men" would in this case be emphatic. In the Transfiguration Jesus may have received a clearer and a fuller intimation of the Divine will concerning His Passion. His "exodus which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem" (Luke ix. 30) was not to be like Moses' or Elijah's, but the Divine purpose would be fulfilled in a human crime. The communication to the disciples would be intended to do for the rest what the Transfiguration was intended to do for the favoured three witnesses, to assure them that Jesus was fulfilling the Divine will. A second interpretation is more obvious. It may be the betrayal by Judas that is referred to. It has already been suggested that even at Cæsarea Philippi the evil purpose may have begun to form in the soul of Judas ? On the return to Galilee Jesus may

have detected still clearer indications of that purpose. Would not this intimation be not only a warning to the other disciples, but also an appeal to Judas? For we should do Jesus a serious moral injustice by assuming that He did not do all He could to restrain Judas, not by forcible prevention but by moral persuasion. Judas was, during these months, engaged in a serious contest with the love of His Master. The writer ventures to suggest a third interpretation, although he has not been able to discover whether linguistic usage allows or forbids it. It is offered in the hope that it may be corrected or confirmed. May not the reference be to the handing over of Jesus by the Jewish rulers after His rejection by them to the *Gentiles*? If Jesus did anticipate this, then it would become clear to Him that it would be by the Gentile mode of execution—the Cross—that He would die.

(12) The mood in which the third announcement (Matt. xx. 17-19; Mark x. 32-34; Luke xviii. 31-34) was made on the way to Jerusalem is indicated by Mark. "And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid" (x. 32). Bruce's comment deserves quotation: "The astonishment of the Twelve and the fear of others were not due to the fact that Jesus had, against their wish, chosen to go to Jerusalem in spite of apprehended danger (Weiss). These feelings must have been awakened by the *manner* of Jesus, as of one labouring under strong emotion. Only so can we account for the fear of the crowd, who were not, like the Twelve, acquainted with Christ's forebodings of death. Memory and expectation were both active at that moment, producing together a high-strung state of mind. . . . Filled with the varied feelings excited by these sacred recollections and tragic anticipations, He walks alone by preference, step and gesture revealing what

is working within and inspiring awe" (*The Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. 412, 413). In this announcement the features of the previous ones are repeated, and the last scene of scorn and shame, suffering and sorrow is vividly anticipated. Probably as soon as Jesus became certain that He would be handed over to, and suffer at the hands of, the Gentiles, His imagination would dwell on the details of the crucifixions which He had witnessed, until the complete picture of the tragedy stood clearly before His inner eye, and moved His deepest feelings. We may thus venture to trace the psychological process by which the Passion became more and more a distinctly anticipated reality for Jesus; for this does not involve any denial of a Divine illumination from the beginning to the end of the experience. It was not by earthly prudence, but by heavenly wisdom that He interpreted the course of events, even as the prophets of old had done, as indicating to Him step by step the path of His Father's will. What we must avoid is a *supernaturalism* that ignores the human thought, feeling, will, to which the divine wisdom, righteousness, and grace are imparted.

(13) The three formal announcements of the Passion have been dealt with one after another; but we must now turn back to a reference which is found only in Luke's Gospel (xiii. 31-33). Towards the close of the Galilean ministry the Pharisees conveyed to Jesus a warning that Herod intended to kill Him, and advised Him to leave Galilee. Whether their motives were friendly or hostile, whether the intention they ascribed to Herod was real or not, whether they were anxious for Jesus' safety or only desirous of getting Him away to Jerusalem where they expected still greater peril for Him, we cannot confidently determine. Jesus showed His contempt for Herod's cunning by His answer, two features of which are important

for our present purpose. The phrase "the third day I am perfected" (ver. 32) may mean either "soon I will finish my work of healing and teaching" or "soon I am perfected by a martyr's death." The second meaning is more probable. That martyrdom He felt must be accomplished in Jerusalem; "it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (ver. 33). This certainty made Him quite indifferent to Herod's threats. But whence this certainty? John, the greatest of the prophets before Him, had perished in Machærus. That might be "an offence against the fitness of things" (Bruce), but what assured Jesus that such an offence could not be repeated in His case? He was conscious of being divinely appointed as Messiah of the Jewish nation. His rejection, culminating in His death, and involving the doom of the nation, must be a national act, through the recognized rulers of the nation at the centre of the nation's life. A provincial ruler of doubtful title could not represent the Jewish nation, nor could it be held responsible for his act.

(14) How significant Jesus regarded His death as being is indicated by His declaration in response to the request of the sons of Zebedee and their mother. The ambition and rivalry of the disciples are rebuked by the example of Jesus. The highest honour is to be won by service, "even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life as a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28). His death is brought under the common category of the service which alone ensures greatness; but it is surely at the same time assigned a unique value in the phrase by which it is described, "a ransom for many." It is not the purpose of these *Studies* to expound Christian doctrines; and even if it were, any discussion of the significance of Christ's death for the doctrine of the Atonement from the standpoint of His "inner life" here adopted would need

to follow the *Studies* on the *Agony in Gethsemane* and the *Desolation of the Cross*. Meanwhile it must suffice for the writer to affirm very emphatically that he cannot believe that in these words Jesus is indicating a universal human function, but he must hold that Jesus in anticipating death looked forward to the necessary consummation of His unique personal vocation as Saviour of mankind. The phrase means at least that by His death there would be accomplished for mankind a deliverance which could not otherwise be effected, and that the value He Himself attached to this deliverance is to be measured by the sacrifice He was willing to endure to secure it.

(15) That in the parable of the householder (Matt. xxi. 33-44) Jesus refers to Himself as the Son, for whom the Father expects reverence, but whom the husbandmen slay in order that they may seize the inheritance, is beyond doubt or question. His own worth to God is here indicated, as also the severity of the judgment deserved by men capable of so great a crime as His death. His defence of Mary, when blamed with waste in anointing Him (Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9; John xii. 1-8), seems to throw some further light on His anticipation of His Passion. He commends the anointing as a good work wrought on Himself; He reminds His disciples of the approaching separation; He defends the act as a preparation for burial; He binds the memory of this deed with indissoluble bonds to the Gospel. What was its significance, then, which gave it such value? It cannot mean less than that Mary, anticipating the Passion of the Master, offered Him this token of her affection, sympathy, devotion to comfort and encourage Him. The disciples were unsympathetic and unresponsive; the Cross to them was a stumblingblock; but Mary had so learned from Jesus what His purpose was that by this symbolic act she welcomed Him as her Saviour

and her Lord. But we may ask, When had she learned these lessons? Does not the narrative in Luke x. 38-42 suggest the answer? The good part chosen by Mary which Jesus would not take away from her was to listen reverently, obediently, sympathetically, nay even appreciatively, as He spoke to her of what was the heavy burden on His own heart. That to Him was far better than the meat and the drink that busy Martha would prepare for Him. Surely we may allow ourselves to believe that Jesus, during these months of loneliness, when His disciples were in the deepest purpose of His life estranged from and opposed to Him, was not left altogether un comforted and uncheered; but found at least one loving and loyal heart that looked forward to His Passion even as He Himself did, as the consummation of His ministry in the fulfilment of His Father's will.

(16) The utterances regarding His death which are assigned to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel may be very briefly referred to. Reference has already been made to the Baptist's welcome of Jesus. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (i. 29), as probably an echo of Jesus' own teaching when He communicated to John His purpose to realize the ideal of the Servant of Jehovah. The saying about the Serpent in the Wilderness, already dealt with, may be compared with the later utterance, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (xii. 32), as both teach that the exaltation on the Cross was necessary for the fulfilment of His beneficent purpose. The necessity of the death for the spiritual life of mankind, taught in the passage already discussed (John vi. 51, "I give my flesh for the life of the world"), is also asserted in John x. 11, "the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep." This surrender of life is voluntary. "No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself" (ver. 18). This surrender of life is the

greatest proof of love. "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends" (xv. 13). It is also a consecration of Himself to God for the consecration of His disciples (xvii. 19). The circumstances invest with peculiar interest the declaration, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone ; but if it die, it beareth much fruit" (xii. 24). The request of the Greeks seems to have moved Jesus deeply. It seems even to have suggested to Him "the possibility of a Gentile ministry as an escape from Jewish hostility" (see the *Fourteenth Study*, paragraph 10). Yet this possibility was dismissed, because He recognized the absolute necessity of His death to the fulfilment of His purpose. To be the world's Saviour He must be slain as the Jewish Messiah. The Fourth Gospel agrees with the Synoptics in asserting that Jesus regarded His death as necessary for the fulfilment of His purpose ; it lays special emphasis on the voluntariness of that death in love for man and obedience to God.

(17) This *Study* must be drawn to a close by a consideration of the institution of the Lord's Supper in its bearings on Christ's anticipation of His death (Matt. xxvi. 17-30 ; Mark xiv. 12-26 ; Luke xxii. 7-38 ; John xiii.-xiv.). The first point to be noted in this connexion is the repeated announcement of betrayal. How tender is the appeal and how solemn the warning to Judas ! but the last effort to rescue the traitor is in vain ; and Jesus is relieved when he withdraws. The second point is the prediction of the desertion of the disciples and of Peter's denial, which is represented by Matthew and Mark as spoken on the way to Gethsemane (xxvi. 31-35 ; xiv. 27-31), but by Luke and John as delivered in the Upper Room (xxii. 31-34 ; xiii. 36-38). This prediction is a proof of the moral insight and spiritual discernment of Jesus ; the secrets of the hearts of His disciples were not hid from Him. His words to

Peter, as recorded in Luke (xxii. 31-32), "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat ; but I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not ; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren," show how serious was the peril for Peter that Jesus foresaw ; how earnest was His solicitude for him ; and how confident He was of an answer to His prayer. The prediction is further an evidence that Jesus anticipated that He would need to face His Passion without the sympathy or the support of any of His disciples. Nevertheless His confidence in a happy issue out of all His afflictions is unabated. This is the third point to be noted, He expects that these disciples, who will be scattered in doubt and fear, will be so restored to Him, that His dying commands will be sacred to them, and that they will be willing to remember His death not as an evil to be deplored, but as a good wherein they may rejoice. His approaching sacrifice He Himself is able to regard, and they will afterwards be able to regard, as invested with the deepest significance and highest value. It will be both the sign and the means of a new relation between man and God, of which the characteristic blessing will be the forgiveness of sin. In what sense the death of Jesus was the sacrifice of the new covenant cannot yet be discussed ; but meanwhile be it noted that Jesus faced His death as, not an evil to be escaped, but as a good to be welcomed.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE ANTICHRIST OF 2 THESSALONIANS.

I PROPOSE in this paper to review once more the problem of the above difficult passage, on the assumption of the genuineness of the Epistle. Granted that Paul wrote it, whom could he mean by the man of sin? It may in the end prove impossible to secure a satisfactory interpretation on the assumption that the Epistle is genuine; but we ought to exhaust every effort to save the threatened limb before we yield to those who favour violent measures.

Our key must be furnished by what we read in 1 Thessalonians ii. 14-16, and in several passages of the Acts, regarding the hostility of unconverted Jews towards the Pauline Gospel. Later, when a party of the Jewish Christians have become leaders in the same hostility, we hear less about the machinations of un-Christianized Jews. Paul, in 1 Thessalonians, draws an analogy between the persecutions endured by the Thessalonians and those endured by the primitive Christian community—the “churches of Judea.” In so speaking, he implies a wholly favourable view of the Jerusalem disciples. They are typical sufferers and typical Christians. Correspondingly, those who wrong them are the typical enemies of God, upon whom *the wrath is come to the uttermost*. If, then, Paul believed in Anti-Christ—the great leader of godlessness—he must inevitably place him, at this stage in his thoughts, among the Jews.¹ Outwardly, indeed, and nominally, the Jews continue to be God’s friends and worshippers. Inwardly, however, St. Paul conceives, they are God’s most determined enemies, and as such their case is hopeless. This may seem to us a bitter judgment; and perhaps it is. But, when we think of Jewish malignity towards St. Paul and towards his Lord

¹ Later stages may not have room for such a figure at all. That is one of the difficulties of the passage.

—a malignity which, as regards the disciple at any rate, eighteen centuries have done little to dilute—the judgment appears psychologically intelligible. What, then, is the future to bring? First and foremost, the Jews must unmask. They must appear in their true colours—not even seeming friends, but open enemies of God. This, then, is “the apostasy” (2 Thess. ii. 3) of which the Apostle had told his converts, and which they ought to keep in mind as the first great signal of the tragic drama of judgment.

The importance of “the apostasy,” however, is almost lost in what is to accompany it. For the movement is to find its personal head and embodiment in the man of sin. That great ungodly Jew is to be guilty of wickednesses which, unlikely as they may seem to be committed by a Jew, will yet, when they do occur, bear a character of outrage and horror in him beyond what they could have in any other. Thus they will mark unbelieving Judaism for what it is. They will show its hatred of God. Details are drawn chiefly from Old Testament passages, notably the picture of Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel xi.,¹ but also Ezekiel’s denunciation of the King of Tyre (xxviii. 2). Caligula’s demand, that his statue should be placed in the temple at Jerusalem, has also probably influenced St. Paul. Transferred to a Jew, the claim of worship becomes even more hideous. Yet that is just what Paul expects. The more wicked, the more likely to be found in the programme of the “man of lawlessness.”

There is greater difficulty in divining what can be meant by the restraining force—neuter at verse 6, masculine at verse 7. What could that be which held back an ungodly Judaism from its full development? Might it be the presence of those suffering saints, the Christians of Jerusalem?

¹ Probably already interpreted, before St. Paul, as a picture of Antichrist.

“For the elect’s sake” (Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20),¹ God might restrain the full development of Jewish wickedness, while these were praying and labouring in the midst of Israel. In Paul’s mood of mind, however, he will expect matters to be pushed to an extreme. He may think that this malignant anti-Christian Judaism will drive out the Church. The Book of Acts traces the growing wickedness of the Jews upon similar lines. After Stephen’s death, all Christians leave Jerusalem “except the Apostles” (viii. 1); but, when Peter himself must flee (xii. 17), it is time for the systematic Gentile mission to begin (xiii. 1 and following chapters).² Or perhaps Paul may expect something beyond that. The Jews may kill out rather than drive out the Christian Church—making an end in the most tragic fashion. If none of these conjectures quite satisfies—if the context seems to demand something more definitely supernatural—we might meet the critic’s expectations without renouncing our historical construction. We might add to it. It may be accompanied by a supernatural reflex. Why should not the angel of Israel—“Michael your prince” (Dan. x. 21)—occupy his place, and avert the worst, while there are Christian Jews mixed with the destined followers of Anti-Christ? If the Jews drive out or kill out the Christians, they may at the same time be driving away their own angel guardian.

Or we might turn in quite another direction for the interpretation of the “restraint,” and think, with the general exegetical tradition, of the Roman empire and emperor. The Jews are the men of the law. Everything lawless is a horror to them, if we are to judge by what they

¹ The words are quoted as a parallel, not as an authority directly moulding Paul’s thought.

² Compare M. Baumgarten’s Commentary. If not the full and exhaustive Divine teleology which Baumgarten thinks it, the sequence of events he expounds is none the less St. Luke’s pragmatism as a historian.

say. But their deeds, time after time, in city after city, show them to be the patrons of lawless violence. Such check as they meet with is furnished by the great Pagan empire. *The mystery of lawlessness*—unrevealed in its full scope—*doth already work* : when God breaks the civilized heathen power, this last worst enemy of goodness, lawless anti-Christian Judaism, will burst forth in a final defiance of God and His Christ. If such was St. Paul's train of thought, he might well confine himself to vague hints, especially in writing. Even to contemplate the fall of the Empire, though with regret, must seem to the ruling authorities manifest treason.

When the obstacle (whatever it is) ceases to operate, all will be ready for the last scenes. The diabolical counterpart of Jesus will be manifested, with his hideous claims and frauds (v. 9) ; and those who would not have Christ (v. 10), their minds blinded by God's awful judgment (v. 11), will accept a master who, with all his adherents, is doomed to sudden and final destruction at the hands of the returning Christ (v. 8 ; Isa. xi. 4). These verses become much fuller of meaning when we cease to read them as an abstract dogmatic description of the doom of bad men, and take them as a programme for God's special enemies—unbelieving Israel. They would not receive Christ ; they will receive Antichrist greedily. And they shall receive the reward of their choice that it deserves ! ¹

If we look through the passage in the light of the above suggestions, it may seem to us that it contains strangely little which points with any certainty towards the Jews. But we must not do it injustice. We must take it as it presents itself ; and it does not profess to be a teaching, but only a reminder. In his oral discourses—so we may fairly understand—Paul made everything plain. Now, he

¹ Are the Jews also aimed at in 2 Thess. i. 8 ?

has only to make allusions, in the cryptic phrases which apocalyptists love. He has told of the apostasy of Israel and of the rise of its diabolically wicked leader. The special point of importance at the moment is not who the Antichrist is, but *that there is to be an Antichrist* before the end of all things. When he forces himself to speak of Antichrist, St. Paul must needs do so in tones of emotion, in accents of horror. But that is incidental, inevitable. It is not done in order to teach the readers ; they had been taught before. It is simply the right language for such thoughts ; or it is relief to the speaker's mind.

It may be harder to conceive how St. Paul could advance from 2 Thessalonians ii. as now interpreted to Romans xi. But, in any case, he had to move from 1 Thessalonians ii. 16 to the same contrasted goal ; it is unpardonable to strike out a passage, like that in 1 Thessalonians, which belongs to the well-attested text of an unquestionably Pauline epistle. And there are considerations which at any rate lessen the difficulty. For one thing, it lies in the nature of apocalyptic, whoever practises it, to revise its calculations under pressure from facts. Besides, the Paul of 1 and 2 Thessalonians is still, in thought, largely a Jew. He is overwhelmed with the horrible mystery of his nation's rejection of Jesus and persecution of Christian evangelists. His nation becomes to him an image of Antichrist. Heaven and earth are waiting till due judgment can be executed. He himself is rescuing before the Advent a few souls—Gentile souls ; for to the Gentiles he has been sent—that he may lead them by the hand when he meets the returning Judge and Saviour : “ These have I gained for Thee ! ” (1 Thess. ii. 19, 20). Such are the limits of Paul's horizon as yet. In the next few years his thoughts widen. Though he still—and always : Philippians iii. 20 ; iv. 5—expects the Advent within a very short time, he rejoices to realize

that the whole world is to have the message of the Gospel (Rom. i. 5), and, persuaded that God has "mercy upon all" (Rom. xi. 32), he recalls to mind that Israel was chosen of old, and allows himself to subordinate even Israel's sin to the thought of God's electing grace.¹ Some Christian scholars charge the later programme with "Jewish particularism" in thought; but we surely must admit that it breathes the Christian spirit more fully, or more deeply, than either 1 Thessalonians ii. or 2 Thessalonians ii. Ought we to add, that the supplanting of Jews by Judaizers as chief enemies of the Pauline Gospel may have helped to lessen the Apostle's sense of the wickedness of his unbelieving brethren? It could hardly fail, at any rate, to lessen his sense of the glory of the Christian Church at Jerusalem as the typical saints and sufferers. And that tends towards lightening the shadow which lies upon the unbelieving nation.

It is not probable that what is here suggested will be thought successful all through the passage. Perhaps it will not succeed at any point, at least as it stands. Criticism is a real and formidable ordeal. Yet something may be gained, if scholars are led to study the passage more carefully, treating it as genuinely Pauline. Had 2 Thessalonians ii. come from a *falsarius*, could he have afforded to confine himself to dark hints? Does not the very obscurity of the passage confirm the account it gives of itself, viz. that it is a later reference to previous clearer teachings communicated by word of mouth?

¹ It strikes one as strange that 1 Thess. should bid men "watch," and 2 Thess. add: "Oh, but the end cannot come till the man of lawlessness has been manifested." Still, this strangeness is inherent in the Second Epistle, whatever view we take of its date and authorship. It is, indeed, inherent in the eschatological and apocalyptic line of teaching, which, if on one side exciting men to a frenzy, yet marks out a programme, and theorizes learnedly upon "times and seasons."

*STATISTICS OF SABBATH KEEPING IN
BABYLONIA.*

It has often been stated that the institution of the Sabbath, or weekly rest-day, amongst the Hebrews went back to some pre-Mosaic custom, either "part of the common Semitic tradition" or "borrowed from Babylonia." Before either of these hypotheses can be accepted, we should be sure that Babylonia had it to lend or that Babylonia shared the tradition. At one time, there seemed to be no doubt that the Sabbath was a Babylonian institution, and the supposed fact was regarded as a confirmation of Holy Scripture. Then it was exploited in the interests of orthodoxy against "Higher Criticism," then it was used to explain the origin of the Hebrew Sabbath and now it is denied (in the interests of orthodoxy ?) on the ground of statistics. The theological bearing of a fact should make no difference to our method of examination of it, unless perhaps to make us more careful.

The existence of some peculiarity about the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th days of a month in Babylonia is vouched for by the Hemerologies for the months of Arahšamna and the second or intercalary Elul. This peculiarity was shared by the 19th, which would be the 49th from the commencement of the previous month. Part of that peculiarity was that on these five special days certain acts were forbidden, and the general impression has been that such observances rendered these days a parallel to the Hebrew Sabbaths. The name *šabbattu*, given to some days, seemed a good argument for supposing that this was their name; but it is only proved that the 15th was called *šabbattu*. The theory built up on these facts by Schrader, Lotz, Sayce and others is well stated by Professor Driver in his com-

mentary on *Genesis* (p. 34 f.) or in his article "Sabbath" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (iv. p. 391a). The difficulties of accepting these days as prototypes of the Hebrew Sabbaths are emphasized in the article "Sabbath" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

Lately, Professor Schiaparelli, in his excellent work, *Astronomy in the Old Testament*, has called attention to a statistical method of estimating the degree of observance of the Sabbath in Babylonia. There exist in our museums many thousands of dated documents of all sorts, commercial deeds, contracts, receipts, memoranda, etc. It might be thought that a careful examination of these should show whether there was in Babylonia any marked abstention from business on the days above indicated as possible Sabbaths. If it should prove that fewer documents were dated on those days than on the ordinary days of the month, we might conclude that those days were regarded as not proper for business. This would go some way towards showing that the Babylonians had a Sabbath rest-day, which they kept on the 7th, 14th, 21st and 28th of the month, and also a "Sabbath of Sabbaths" on the 19th. It is not the purpose of this paper to argue concerning the nature of the parallels between the Babylonian and Hebrew Sabbaths, nor to touch on the question whether the Hebrews "borrowed" from the Babylonians. All that is attempted is an examination of the statistics hitherto presented.

Some preliminary considerations deserve attention.

1. It is not certain that the 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th and 19th of every month in Babylonia were *such* Sabbaths as we are to look for. If we find no special observance by abstinence from business for these days, that will only show that the Babylonians did not observe those days in *that* way. It will not show that they were not "Continental Sundays." We will therefore waive the meaning of

Sabbath altogether and examine what, if any, were the days of abstention from business.

2. It is not yet certain that the 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th and 19th were "holidays" in the months not vouched for by the two Hemerologies. It is presumed that they were, and there seems to be no reason why we should not make the assumption for statistical purposes; only we must recollect that if statistics show that these days were not kept free from secular business we may only be showing that these five days were not holidays all through the year. To check the Hemerologies we must confine ourselves to the same months.

3. If at any period the Babylonians did adopt a seven-day week throughout the year, as the Jews did, it is clear that the Sabbaths would not fall on the 7th, etc., in every month. Statistics of the days on which business was done will fail to reveal these holidays altogether. Our examination must therefore proceed on the assumption that the 7th day of *each* month ought to be a holiday. If we find that it shows no abstention from secular business, we may only be proving that the Sabbath did not always fall on the 7th of the month.

4. Babylonia was frequently conquered by foreign races. The Kassite rule lasted nearly 600 years. The Persians may have brought about a neglect of the Sabbath day. The Assyrians adopted Babylonian customs, and in other points are known to have been very conservative; while (under Kassite and other influence) Babylonia abandoned its old customs. If the Sabbath was a Babylonian institution *originally*, we are more likely to find traces of it preserved in Assyria than in Babylonia under the Kassites, or the Persians. If its observance as a holiday from secular business be negatived by our statistics for these periods, we may only be proving foreign influence for those periods and

have nothing to argue from them as to the observance of the Sabbath as a holiday in proper Babylonian times. Here we must remark that if we do find the 7th, etc., of the month marked by abstention from secular business at such periods, we can only conclude that it would have been more marked still in earlier days. Strictly speaking, we ought to confine ourselves to those periods when Babylonia was free from foreign influence. That can only be the period of the First Dynasty of Babylon, the Hammurabi period. It is usually held that this is the period to which the Hemerologies, above referred to, really belong. At any rate, the second Elul is only vouched for then and very much later.

5. Supposing that we are seeking to find out whether the 7th, etc., were observed by abstention from *secular* business, we ought to exclude all dates of records of *religious* acts. No doubt many of us enter and date collections, services, etc., on Sunday. It would be manifestly unfair to collect and quote such dates against our observance of a Sunday rest. The line is difficult to draw for a land like Babylonia, where every contract was sworn to in the temple, and may have been regarded as a religious act. But surely payments of tithe, offerings of gifts to the temple, payments of priests' salaries, for all of which dated receipts were given, ought not to be quoted as evidence that the Sabbath was not observed by abstention from secular business. In fact, the Babylonian temples did a vast amount of business, which we may call secular, on what we are seeking to find Sabbaths. Did they profane the Sabbath and remain blameless? It is naturally the easiest plan to count all dated documents without inquiry as to their nature, and if we find a marked abstention from business on the 7th, etc., we have a positive argument; but, if we include a large number of temple records, the occurrence

of much business done on the Sabbath will prove nothing as against the layman's observance of the Sabbath as a holiday. We ought then to consider carefully the nature of the documents executed on the supposed Sabbaths. Marriages may have been celebrated by preference on the Sabbath. Adoptions, manumissions, dedications, and possibly other deeds, were perhaps executed then because of the larger congregations and greater publicity.

6. When we have collected all the dates and arranged them according to the days of the month on which they fall, we examine whether those on the 7th, etc., are fewer than the average. In taking this average we must remember that the month had not always thirty days. We may divide the total by the average length of the month, say 29.53, the number of days in a lunar month. It is doubtful whether this is quite fair. For example, the number of documents executed on the first day may be 40, while the average does not exceed 10. The number executed on the 7th may be 8. This is not quite fairly said to be slightly below the average, *for a day which is not the first*, as that is only about 9.

Now, so far as the published statistics go, all the above considerations appear to have been neglected; at any rate, they have not been expressly stated as considered. It may be well to record what these statistics are and which consideration invalidates them most.

Lotz, in his *Questiones de Historia Sabbati* (p. 66), gives a table based upon 540 dated tablets, in which the simple average should be 18, where the 7th has 17, the 14th 15, the 21st 34, the 28th only 8, the 19th only 1. Here only the last Sabbath seems to have been observed as a holiday, but the 19th is very strictly observed. The table is worthless on every consideration. The documents examined were a few Assyrian contracts, together with the dates given by

Boscawen from the Egibi tablets, *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. vi. (1878) pp. 47-77. The latter are of all dates from Nebuchadnezzar to Darius. Foreign influence, the use of a week running consecutively throughout the year, no distinction of secular and temple business, etc., all may have vitiated the results. We cannot even quote the remarkable result for the 19th, because 19 is often written *20 lal 1*, where *lal* means "less," so that the figures are to be read "20 less 1"; while Boscawen read these (as was usual then) as 21. Hence a number of documents really dated on the 19th are counted to the 21st. How many we do not yet know: but there were many more to be credited to the 19th and as many fewer to the 21st. The only unexceptional result is that there were many fewer dates on the 28th than on an ordinary day. Even this is suspicious, for if the documents which did not "profane the Sabbath" be excluded, 8 may not be below the average.

The present writer in his *Assyrian Deeds and Documents* (vol. ii. p. 40, § 69, 1901), gave the results of examining some 700 documents of the 7th and 8th centuries B.C. The result was that the 7th, etc., did not show any marked abstention from business. "They were not kept with puritan respect for the Sabbath, if Sabbaths they really were. On the 19th day, however, we do seem to have a marked abstinence from business." The only documents dated on that day are possibly two. Of these two, the date of the first is doubtful, the second alone is certain. But the latter is a deed of marriage, possibly a manumission for that purpose. The table is superseded, for its own purpose, by the addition of hundreds more documents; but would be valueless for us because no deductions were made on account of the nature of the business.

It does, however, witness to a remarkable abstention

from business for the 19th. No secular business seems to have been done at all on that day. Professor Jensen, in the Berlin *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschungen* (1900), p. 150 ff., made use of these results, without appearing to be aware of their exact limitation. But Assyrian custom even at the end of the Empire is better witness to Babylonian custom than any evidence from Persian times, and it points to a very complete abstention from business on the "week of weeks."

Professor R. D. Wilson, in the *Princeton Theological Review* (April, 1903, p. 246), gave the results of his examination of 2,554 Babylonian contract tablets. He found that the 7th, etc., showed no falling off in business. "The nineteenth alone shows up as a true day of rest. Only 8 out of 2,554 tablets are dated the nineteenth of the month, less than one-tenth per cent. of the average." It is rather odd that he should add "This nineteenth was a fast rather than a feast day." The dates at any rate could not prove that. The character of the day could only be deduced from the peculiarities given in the Hemerologies, and the question was whether these showed Babylonian Sabbaths. In any case his figures are valueless because no account is taken of the nature of business. Presumably they were taken from Strassmaier's *Babylonische Texte* and include Persian times. Probably the same mistake is made as Boscawen's above, and the 19th is not properly reckoned but confused with the 21st.

Professor Schiaparelli, in his *Astronomy in the Old Testament* (p. 132 note 1), began with Boscawen's figures and deduced results which in his Appendix III. (p. 175) he himself recognized were ill founded. So he examined instead Strassmaier's *Babylonische Texte* and used 2,764 dates. His results are that the 7th, etc., are not marked by any falling off from the average, and even the "week of weeks"

shows 89 dates as against the average 94. Again we must pronounce the table valueless, because no account is taken of the nature of business, and the period covers the Persian kings. It only would show that the Sabbath was not strictly kept then or that the week ran on through the year without beginning again each month.

It is obvious that a proper examination of this statistical evidence will take a long time, and the present writer has not now the opportunity of examining the question fully. All he can do now is to present a few other results, compiled for a different purpose, and trust that if no one else will do it he may be able to return to the question later.

The First Dynasty of Babylon, though a foreign race, were at any rate Semitic, and therefore probably disturbed Babylonian customs little. To their date probably belong the two Hemerologies. An examination of 356 dated documents, giving an average of say 12 per day, shows only 5 for the 7th, 4 for the 14th, 8 for the 21st, 7 for the 28th and 2 for the 19th. There has been no attempt made to exclude temple business, which would certainly reduce the numbers for these days, but also reduce the total and the average. If any one is so disposed, he may ascribe the partial observance of these days to the "Amorite" influence of the Dynasty; but pending a scientific examination of the whole question, the remarkable extent of the observance is significant enough.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

THE STATURE OF CHRIST.

As opinion is always very far ahead of institutions and it ought to be, so ideals are always infinitely in advance of what is practicable for the present, and they ought to be. This perpetual collision between the two, and the eternal reference or challenge from the one to the other and from the achieved to the unachieved, constitute the chief factors in human progress. And strange as it may appear, the ideal is much more real than the actual of the passing moment, just because it embodies the ultimate truth. We must never suppose that the ideal represents the unattainable, though it be only possible when impossible. The merely possible suggests no temptation, offers no splendid risks, confronts us with no insuperable obstacles. Christ recognized this singular fact, this curious element in human nature, in the Sermon on the Mount and in all His fundamental doctrines. He proclaimed the Gospel of the Impossible, and said that what cannot be must be and will be eventually in the final and supreme synthesis. He knew that nobody could pitch too high the standards of ethics and daily conduct. How indeed should Christ have given us a type of excellence short of the very loftiest and of absolute perfection? When we ask the question, we have answered it. For an ordinary ideal accommodating itself to the passions and prejudices of the time or even of centuries, would at length be reached and passed and explained and despised. Man, meant for greater things, carries eternity in his heart and accepts this measure alone!

It seems inexplicable that the transcendental side of our Saviour's teaching has never been fully faced or adequately estimated. Often indeed we find it lightly or ostentatiously ignored, as something either temporary and local intended

to inspire the initial enthusiasm demanded by a new movement, or impudently discounted and depreciated as something known by Christ Himself to be Utopian, and never required to be carried out and translated in serious act and fact. But such a supposition is purely gratuitous and an unwarranted and unwarrantable assumption. Jesus was the most practical Preacher who ever lived. Prophets, or dreamers and seers and visionaries, as we falsely and foolishly call them, are invariably the most sane and sober of persons because they alone see things whole and see the uttermost goal. The politician who shapes his country's course by an obsequious regard for present conditions alone may be a consummate time-server or a master of compromise, but a statesman he is not. We must endeavour to take a complete view of any given subject, by interpreting it in terms of the future. Principles, before their publication, should be thought out to the bitter end and worked out to their remotest logical consequences, however extreme and even contradictory they may appear just now. If we do not begin by going down to the bottom, we shall certainly not arrive at the top. And the beauty of our Master's doctrines resides mainly in this, in their sweet and sublime *unreasonableness*. If we read the Beatitudes, we perceive in a moment the revolutionary reversal of all the old standards and early measures. *Blessed are the poor in spirit : for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are they that mourn : for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek : for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness : for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful : for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart : for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers : for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake : for theirs is the*

Kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for My sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad : for great is your reward in Heaven.

We note in astonishment that the promise of both worlds, all place and power, are lavished on the very last people we should expect to receive them. We feel a shock similar to that which would be inflicted if a master were to present with prizes the boys at the bottom and not at the head of every class and reserved his chief favours for them. "*The poor in spirit,*" "*the mourners*" and penitents, "*the meek*" in conduct, those with a passion for "*righteousness,*" "*the merciful*" and not the mighty, "*the pure in heart*" and not the wise and learned, "*the peacemakers*" and not the conquerors, the "*reviled and persecuted*" and not the rich and prosperous—these are the future possessors of earth, and the present inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. All ancient former methods of esteem seem stultified here. At first sight, the teaching looks like beautiful madness or a sort of Divine insanity. But a closer and deeper examination of these announcements, at once so simple and so exalted, reveals the secret. Christ looked beyond. He saw, He knew that in the end, whether imminent or remote, the reward or victory assuredly awaits the patient and gentle who bear and forbear, who are sinned against and suffer, but yet overcome all and everything at last by their very meekness and weakness.

Popular judgments are often, and perhaps usually, false. And never were they more erroneous or mischievous than in their exposition, or rather explaining away of Christ's great ruling doctrines. We must disregard the letter, we are told, and obey the spirit. For, it is contended, our Lord, who knew human limitations better than we know them ourselves, did not seriously suppose that any one

would take literally His extreme statements. This, we need hardly add, is a cheap way of eluding a difficulty, or a disagreeable task. As it seems quite certain that Christ expected not merely His first followers on their missionary march, as pioneers of a new morality and a new religion, but all believers of every age and country, to practise at whatever cost His tremendous precepts. Because He wished us to understand that Love alone could effect permanent changes and consequences, and saw the whole in the part and the end in the beginning. But this, we shall perceive, is very far from exhausting the subject. For our Saviour, in setting before us a stupendous ideal of character and conduct or ethics in action, *ipso facto* did something far more. He became, He embodied, He *was* the Ideal Himself. *The law was given by Moses, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.* We may maintain that our Lord represented and typified the Ideal, and this cannot be disputed. But this assertion does not plumb the unfathomable deeps and "*unsearchable riches*" of Divine Love. Christ *was* all that He taught, His Life *was* the revelation we required. He proclaimed an Infinite Ideal, and expressed it in His own daily words and works. In Him knowing and being were identical. And thence follows logically an immense and immeasurable consequence. For as the One Perfect Man, our Lord prefigured the future man—what every one would finally attain, in His Power, by a Divine birthright.

In the process of the centuries, time is cheap, and a million more or less can make no difference. God thinks in ages and provides accordingly. And Christ only summarized in Himself and anticipated in His Sacred Person, the grand ultimate issues, when we shall all be like Him and be as gods. Indeed, were not this expressly and exactly symbolized by His doing and suffering, His healing

and teaching, His miraculous deeds and yet more miraculous silences and inactivities, we might almost venture to suspect a waste of effort or meaningless parade of infinite possibilities. Had not Christ aimed at a direct personal application of His Ideal to ourselves, as something to be eventually appropriated and assimilated by every disciple of His, much of His overflowing energy might look not unreasonably idle or non-significant. This, we recognize at once, is inconceivable. Divine Grace, though the most prodigal thing in the world and lavished universally without stint or stay, we are obliged to consider also as the most parsimonious. In this respect, that every outpouring of Love or Power has a definite object and never was a bow drawn at a venture. God knows precisely what He wants, so much and no more, and the means are severely proportioned to the end desired. Divine Bounty and Divine Parsimony invariably work together, go hand in hand, and mutually correct, if the language may be allowed, and complete each other.

So shall My Word be that goeth forth out of My mouth : it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. The appeal lies to the future, but we read the promise that nothing will be or can be wasted. Nothing determined by God ever was in vain. Divine teleology rests at the root, however latent or obscure, of the humblest aspiration or the dimmest and feeblest *nisus* of the embryo recapitulating in the womb of his mother the history of the race, that it may so some day contribute its own tiny effort and go a little farther still itself. Christ's miraculous Powers, as we call them—though if we stood in the same perfect relation to God and in the same perfect harmony with the cosmos and its laws and God's Will, we also should have at our disposal all the resources

(known and unknown) of the Cosmos and should find ourselves lords of Nature with matter malleable in our hands—were a promise and prophecy of our own future powers. He has given pledges that cannot be broken. The shadow of His mantle, so to speak—nay, of His own Omnipotence, in the shadow of the Cross, fell on the whole of humanity then. Theologians have rashly assumed that our Lord's extensions of consciousness and ability, of wisdom and might, began and ended in Him, and possessed no value or application for His followers. While, as a matter of fact, the very contrary holds true. And there is nothing that our Saviour did which we shall not accomplish ourselves when He has realized Himself in us and we have realized ourselves in Him and entered into the fulness of His and our Kingdom.

The history or course of evolution shows, if it shows anything, that organs to be future factors of vital importance in the development of the species, by natural selection and the survival of the fittest, commence by being apparently the unfittest and utterly useless, while they really adumbrate the perfect powers to come. This then being an elementary law, as every text-book of science on the subject teaches, it follows that we should antecedently expect the same testimony in the various stages of man's progress since history. If, our Lord declared—*Consider the lilies how they grow*—the contemplation of the lilies was a liberal education (*καταμάθετε*)—we may well hope to find even more profitable instruction in human development. Nurses protest that babies talk Hebrew, which they believe to be the language of heaven, though this would put a heavy premium on Oriental or Semitic scholarship and would severely limit, at any rate for a time, our intercourse with each other hereafter. But, though babies do not talk Hebrew, there can be no reasonable

doubt that they repeat the early efforts of the race in speech, and yet at the same time their actions look forward as well as backward. For they not merely display marked reminiscences of their arboreal ancestors the anthropoid apes, but they foreshadow, though dumbly and darkly, the grand and gracious destiny that awaits them. And, whatever view we may take of man's evolution, we must all agree at any rate that from the dawn of history the movement on the whole, in spite of temporary eclipses and interruptions, has been upward and not downward.

Man has been in the making, physically, mentally, morally and spiritually. His record is one of ascent and not descent, as we increase our knowledge of it. Races have come and gone, mighty civilizations appeared and disappeared; there were often intervals of prolonged and profound darkness, with occasional reactions and brief returns to the early lower type; still on the whole we delight to believe in a general improvement all round, in spite of the vices and follies that accompany growing culture and like weeds endeavour to choke it. Now have we any right to set a limit to this upward trend and argue that man is in body and mind and morals and religion complete? It seems hardly philosophical to do this. We can only proceed by analogy, and reason from the behaviour of the past to the probable behaviour of the future. If universal improvement has characterized the one, we may confidently reckon on universal improvement for the other. We only learn by failure, but yet we do learn something at least, and to understand our present lack of success guarantees a final achievement of success. An ignorant child, at first, while watching the flowing tide, might imagine from the retreat of every broken wave that there was no advance. But he would soon discover his mistake. None but the pessimist can maintain "*Sic omnia fatis in*

pejus ruere ac retro sublapsa referri," But humanity at heart is infinitely and eternally optimistic, and knows better.

For while the tired waves vainly breaking
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back through creeks and inlets making
Comes silent flooding in the main.

We may decline to accept the facts, but it is useless to dispute the report that since the world of history began there have always been men and women and sometimes even children with abnormal faculties, whether consisting in the indefinite enlargements of those that we all enjoy in common or in senses altogether new. Such persons may be classified indifferently, according to the point of view or the prejudices of science, as cranks or monsters with some part of the mind hypertrophied at the expense of the remaining powers, or as incarnations of divine genius. But whatever we call them, it is from such individuals with such astonishing extensions of consciousness, or such super-consciousness, that the prophets and poets and seers and artists and musical composers and great writers and orators arise. We may sometimes think them half insane, and sometimes say so, and yet it is the madmen on the last analysis that rule the world. It is their glorious intuitions, transcending at a single bound the circuitous processes of reason—it is their ideas and ideals, their splendid inspirations, that are all our light and life. The fire they steal from heaven, from the region of the ruling universal thoughts—

The thoughts that wander through eternity—

illuminates our lower skies and lower earth, and keeps ever burning the sacred flame of that altar at which we kindle all our petty tapers, though we know it not.

Now in our Lord Jesus Christ these abnormal faculties became normal, because in Him alone they found a Being in absolute correspondence with both the Divine and the material environment. He could not help healing the sick and suffering when virtue went out of Him wherever He was and whithersoever He moved. Free full Life, embodied in Him, and in perfect tune with the will and laws of God, necessarily and naturally communicated itself to all around Him who were receptive and possessed hospitable hearts and minds in faith that operated through Love. *He could not be hid. The odour of the ointment filled the house,* and the whole world has been sweet with it ever since. *His Name was as ointment poured forth.*

Never man spake like this Man, for He taught as one having authority and not as the scribes. We are all aware how the mere presence of a beautiful, strong, sympathetic personality radiates health and strength on all within its reach and even far outside the visible and sensible limits. Superabundant faculties of life and hope, of hope and faith and happiness, diffuse themselves at once and impress their own vital character on all around them. But in Christ that overflow of virtue or vitality, that we feel occasionally in a few gifted persons, was constant and continuous because liable to no interruptions of human infirmity or imperfection. He concentrated, epitomized, in Himself every glorious faculty sparsely distributed among isolated individuals and other gifts till then unknown.

Because He was completely "*pure in Heart*" He read people's thoughts as we read an open book. The flesh presented no veil to Him, when the Spirit reigned and ruled and kept the servant in its proper position as a tool and not a tyrant. He stood face to face always with eternal realities, and from His perfect knowledge of everything could make a perfect and immediate use of everything

—not for Himself but for others. In obedience to the supreme cosmic law of self-sacrifice and vicarious suffering, He realized Himself in us by bearing the burdens of our sins and sorrows. Love, unsophisticated love, is when once really reached and lived an immense extension of faculty, and multiplies all our commonplace powers a hundredfold. As much may be asserted of faith. They both annihilate old boundaries, and bring new worlds into being and reduplicate our usefulness. Power without faith would be uncertain in its action, like the strokes of a blind and blundering giant. Power without love would be merely diabolical. It may be that men will sooner discern the foolishness than the wickedness of sin. But however it be accomplished, the victory over sin for every soul was promised infallibly in the Person of Christ, and the pledge was signed and sealed by His precious blood upon the Cross. Even now, upon the whole, we may dare to believe evil is a diminishing quantity. And in the light of our Ideal we can rest assured that its pride has been broken for ever.

The abnormal of to day will be the normal of to-morrow. The wildest dreams and speculations of poets and visionaries are now the trifles of fools and the toys of children. The golden age lies before us and not behind. Science, though it repudiates its ancestry and forgets that it was cradled by religion, while devoutly fighting against Christ's Gospel of the Impossible, yet every hour is helping on and making more practicable the very thing that it professes to hate but adores at heart. It really co-operates with Him in fact, while in words it denies its Master. Telepathy and telaesthesia, clairvoyance and clairauidience, illustrated by wireless telegraphy and the mysteries of radium and "radiobes" and those awful new forces now beginning to reveal their secrets, seem no longer so incredible. We still

draw the line at Spiritualism. But after all the ancient barriers between the two worlds, the visible and the invisible, the material and the immaterial, are breaking down, and it appears exceeding difficult now to decide where matter ends and mind or spirit commences. And to the dispassionate and unprejudiced it does indeed look as if the coming man, the man of the future, will be almost Godlike in his capabilities and have even read the innermost secret of life. "*They that seek the Lord understand all things.*" "*Thou shalt see greater things than these.*" "*He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also ; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto My Father.*" Popular belief and expectation have always travelled along these lines. "*But when the multitudes saw it they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.*" The apostles certainly entertained this faith. "*Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.*" The endless process of transfiguration will continue, till each of us at last recognizes the stupendous fact, that we cannot escape our Divine obligations, or retreat from the battle to which the cosmos calls us—that each of us is like God the Prisoner of Love and the Prisoner of Eternity.

F. W. ORDE WARD.

A SUGGESTION ON ST. JOHN XIX. 14.

IN his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* Dr. Edersheim gives strong reasons for maintaining that St. John's Gospel does not differ from the Synoptists in regard to the Last Supper. He takes the passages which are superficially said to be contradictory and argues that they really support a consistent agreement.

1. St. John xiii. 2, *δείπνον γινομένου*, every one now

admits as the true reading and as meaning "while supper was going on." Yet an evil shadow of the old reading *γενομένου* and its A.V. translation "supper being ended" seems to haunt us still.

2. St. John xiii. 27-30 implies not, as is commonly asserted, that the Feast (as distinct from the preceding meal) was to be on the next day, but, on the contrary, that it was at that moment about to begin. For the other disciples could never have thought Judas would be sent out hurriedly in the dark to get things only needed next evening. The Synoptists tell us that the preparation for the Passover was made on the day itself, Luke xxii. 5, 8, etc. But if something had been forgotten, naturally Judas, having the bag, would be sent out to buy it, and that at once. "That thou doest, do quickly."

3. St. John xviii. 28 could hardly refer, says Dr. Edersheim, to fear of defilement which would incapacitate for the evening Passover, for after the evening another day would be begun and the defilement would have passed away. Rather it would refer to defilement disqualifying from some rite or feast during that day. The first point here may be disputable; for it does seem that defilement on a preceding day might disqualify for the after-evening Feast. But the second point is quite clear, viz., that entrance into the Praetorium would disqualify them for a Feast during that day itself, e.g. for the Chagigah Passover which was celebrated at or soon after midday on the day succeeding the great Evening Passover.

There is a further verse on which Dr. Edersheim says little, but which may possibly give still stronger support to his view. In St. John xix. 14 we have a difficulty which on ordinary lines of interpretation is hopelessly inexplicable. For :—

1. If "the sixth hour" means "12 noon," how could

the trial be then going on ? Not only would that contradict the Synoptists who say the Crucifixion began at 9 a.m., but it would not leave sufficient time afterwards for the close of the trial, the leading out to Calvary, and the hours implied before death on the Cross.

2. If "the sixth hour" means 6 a.m., then (a) there seems to be no proof of the existence then of such a mode of reckoning; (b) such reckoning, though perhaps capable of being adapted to, does not suit nearly so well as the known mode, the other passages in St. John where hours of the day are named (i. 39; iv. 6; iv. 52). But (c) chiefly, it seems impossible that at the season of equinox a Roman governor would have begun his court at 5 a.m. or earlier, as he must have done if this outcry far on in the trial took place at 6 a.m.

Thus, apart from the difficulty of reconciliation with the Synoptists' mention of the third hour as the time when the Crucifixion began, this fourteenth verse of St. John xix., as it stands and as it is commonly interpreted, is inexplicable. Is no other explanation of it possible ?

There are various readings which hint at primitive corruption of the text :—

A. B. \aleph read, $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\ \eta\nu\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta$.

Other MSS. read, $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta$.

Some MSS., feeling the difficulty, read $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\eta$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta$.

These warrant, especially in view of the inherent difficulties named above, some conjecture. Suppose the original reading was $\eta\nu\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha\ \acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\ \acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta$ —to be translated : "Now there was preparation for the Passover at (or for) about the sixth hour," i.e. the Jews had before them that day the Chagigah Passover, which, as Dr. Edersheim shows, was also called Passover, and had to be celebrated about midday or soon after. For this, the Jews not only avoided going into the Praetorium, but now, as the trial dragged on, about 8 a.m. they became impatient ;

and when Pilate again remonstrated with them in favour of their king, they roared out (*ἐκπαύρασαν*), ἄρον, ἄρον, as though saying in the vulgar slang of a modern mob : "Hurry up ! we cannot wait here all the day ; get rid of this fellow and let us go to prepare our Feast."

The textual alteration suggested is very slight, and only in words already doubtful in the MSS. The sentence as emended comes in much more appositely in the context. The whole narrative of St. John becomes self-consistent and consistent with the Synoptists.

H. G. GREY.

*THE PERMANENCE OF RELIGION AT HOLY
PLACES IN THE EAST.*

IN a recent number of the EXPOSITOR (June and August, 1905), this subject was briefly alluded to in describing the origin of the Ephesian cult of the Mother of God. In that cult we found a survival or revival of the old paganism of Ephesus, viz. the worship of the Virgin Mother of Artemis. The persistence of those ancient beliefs and rites at the chief centres of paganism exercised so profound an influence on the history of Christianity in Asia Minor, that it is well to give a more detailed account of the facts, though even this account can only be a brief survey of a few examples selected almost by chance out of the innumerable cases which occur in all parts of the country. I shall take as the foundation of this article a paper read to the Oriental Congress held at London in autumn, 1902, and buried in the Transactions of the Congress, developing and improving the ideas expressed in that paper, and enlarging the number of examples.

The strength of the old pagan beliefs did not escape the attention of the Apostle Paul ; and his views on the subject

affected his action as a missionary in the cities of Asia Minor, and can be traced in his letters. On the one hand, as the present writer has several times tried to prove, he regarded the Anatolian superstition as a more direct and dangerous enemy than the Greek. Amid the many enemies against which he had to contend, some were less dangerous than others. Sophia, the Greek philosophy, seemed to Paul much less dangerous than Greek religion; it was rather, in a way, a rival erring on false lines than an enemy; and at first the outer world regarded the doctrine of Paul as simply one form of Graeco-Oriental philosophy, and listened to it with a certain degree of tolerance on that understanding. Greek religion, in its turn, hateful as was its careless polytheism, was not nearly so dangerous as the Anatolian devotion and enthusiasm.

On the other hand, Paul saw also that there was, or rather had originally been, even in this degraded superstition and detestable ritual, an element of truth and real perception of the Divine nature. On this point, it is needless to repeat what has been said in the *EXPOSITOR*, October, 1906, page 374 ff.

Before glancing at the effect of the old paganism on the development of the Christian Church, it is well to point out that the influence is still effective down to the present day. The spirit of Mohammedanism is quite as inconsistent with and hostile to the pagan localization of the Divine nature at particular places as Christianity is; but still it has been in practice very strongly influenced by that idea, and the ignorant Moslem peasantry are full of awe and respect both for Christian and for ancient pagan superstitions. A brief outline of the most striking classes of facts observable at the present day will set in a clearer light the strong pressure which popular ideas were continually exerting on the early Christian Church. In giving such an outline

I know that it is dangerous for one who is not an Orientalist to write on the subject. I can merely set down what I have seen and heard among the peasantry, and describe the impression made on me by their own statement of their vague ideas.

In regard to their religious ideas, we begin by setting aside all that belongs strictly to Mohammedanism, all that necessarily arises from the fact that a number of Mohammedans, who live together in a particular town or village, are bound to carry out in common the ritual of their religion, i.e., to erect a proper building, and to perform certain acts and prayers at regular intervals. Anything that can be sufficiently accounted for on that ground has no bearing on the present purpose. All that is beyond this is, strictly speaking, a deviation from, and even a violation of, the Mohammedan religion; and therein lies its interest for us. Mohammedanism admits only a very few sacred localities—Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem. Possibly even the Sunni Mohammedans may allow one or two others, as the Shiya do, but I do not remember to have heard of them. But the actual belief of the peasantry of Asia Minor attaches sanctity to a vast number of localities, and to these our attention is now directed. Without laying down any universal principle, it will appear easily that in many cases the attachment of religious veneration to particular localities in Asia Minor has continued through all changes in the dominant religion of the country.

In the cases where this permanence of religious awe is certain, the sanctity has, of course, taken some new form, or been transferred from its original bearer to some Mohammedan or Turkish personage. Four kinds of cases may be distinguished:—

1. The sanctity and awe gather round the person of some real character of Mohammedan history earlier than the

Turkish period. The typical example is Seidi Ghazi (the Arab general Sayyid al Battal al Ghazi, Seid the Wicked the Conqueror),¹ slain in the battle of Acroenos in A.D. 739, the first great victory which cheered the Byzantine emperors in their attempt to stem the tide of Arab conquest. How this defeated Arab should have become the Turkish hero of the conquest of Asia Minor, after the country had for two centuries been untrod by a Mohammedan foot, is not explained satisfactorily by any of the modern writers, French and German, who have translated or described the Turkish romance relating the adventures of this stolen hero.² He became one of the chief heroes of the Bektash dervishes, that sect to which, I believe, all the Janissaries belonged (I speak under correction in a matter that lies out of my own sphere of study). On Mount Argæus strange stories about him are told. He shares with others the awe attaching to this mountain, the loftiest in Asia Minor, and worshipped as divine by the ancient inhabitants. On the site of an old Hittite city, Ardistama, re-discovered in 1904 on the borders of Cappadocia and Lycaonia, he is

¹ I give the spelling and translation as a distinguished Semitic scholar gave them to me many years ago ; but my friend Mr. Crowfoot, writes from Khartoum suggesting that the first epithet is not the word meaning "wicked," but a very similar cognate noun, meaning "hero." Seid, of course, is strictly a generic term—the Lord, given to all descendants of the Prophet ; but it has in Turkey become a personal name. I find that in my notes formerly I appended a note by Professor Robertson Smith : "Battal, in old Arabic, denotes prowess rather than wickedness." Abd-Allah was the personal name of the Arab general.

² This romance has been translated by Ethé, *Fahrten des Sayyid Ratthal* (Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1871) : see also review by Mohl in *Journal Asiatique* 1874, p. 70 ff. In the romance it is said that the worship of Seid began under Sultan Alaeddin of Komà (1219-1236), when the place where he died was discovered by special revelation, and a tomb was built for him and a great establishment of Dervishes formed at Nakoleia, an ancient Phrygian city, which has henceforth been called Seidi-Ghazi, far north of the scene of the fatal battle. The Dervishes were all scattered, and the splendid building was going to ruin, when I passed that way in 1881 and 1883 : on the reason, see below in the text.

known as Emir Ghazi, the Conqueror Emir. At Nakoleia, in Phrygia, once one of the greatest establishments of dervishes in Asia Minor, now passing rapidly into ruins, his tomb is shown, and that of the Christian princess, his supposed wife.

The mention of the Christian wife of the Moslem conqueror throws some light on the legend. The idea was not lost from the historical memory of the Mohammedans that they were interlopers, and that the legal right belonged to the Christians whom they had conquered. The representative hero of the Moslems must therefore make his possession legitimate by marrying the Princess, who carries with her the right of inheritance. This is a striking example of the persistence of the old Anatolian custom that inheritance passed in the female line. Greek law had superseded the old custom; Roman law had confirmed the principle that inheritance passed in the male line. Christian and Mohammedan custom agreed in that principle. Yet here in the Moslem legend we find the old custom of the land still effective. In Greek legend and Greek history the same tendency for the conquerors to seek some justification and legitimization of their violent seizure is frequently observed; so e.g. the Dorian conquest of the Peloponnesus is represented in legend as the Return of the Heracleidae: the foreign conquerors represent themselves as the supporters and champions of rightful heirs who had been dispossessed and expelled. In many of the old cities of the land (probably in all of them, if we only knew the Moslems better) there linger stories, beliefs and customs, showing that the Mohammedans recognize a certain priority and superiority of right as belonging to the Christian. In the Mosque of St. Sophia at Constantinople the closed door is pointed out through which the priest retired carrying the sacred elements when the capture of the city interrupted the celebra-

tion of the sacrament ; and every one acknowledges that, when the door is opened again, the priest will come back to continue the interrupted ritual of the Christians. In front of the walls of Constantinople is the sacred spring with the fish which shall never be caught until the Christians recover the city : they were taken from the gridiron and thrown into the spring by the priest who was cooking them when the city was stormed, and there they swim until the Christians return. At Damascus, Jerusalem, Thyatira, etc., similar tales are told. At Iconium, on the summit of the hill above the Palace, is a transformed church, once dedicated (as the Greeks say) to St. Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium about 372-400. It was made into a mosque, but every Mohammedan who entered it to pray died (the tale does not specify whether they died at the moment or later), and it ceased to be used as a mosque. Thereafter a wooden clock-tower was built upon it, and the building is at the present day called "the Clock." Inside this is said to be the spring of Plato, which is now dry. In this absurd story we trace the degraded remnants of ancient sanctity ; and there is a mixture of old religious belief in a holy spring, and perhaps an Asylum, with the later Mohammedan idea that intrusion into a Christian shrine always was accompanied by a certain risk.

2. Some personage of Turkish history proper becomes the bearer of the religious awe attaching to certain spots, e.g. Hadji Bektash, who, I am told, led the Janissaries at the capture of Mudania, and from whom the chief seat of the Bektash dervishes derives its name. At this place, now called Mudjur, in Cappadocia, Hadji Bektash has succeeded to the dignity and awe which once belonged to the patron saint of the bishopric of Doara.

Another such character is Karaja Ahmed, who has his religious home in several parts of the country, sometimes,

at least, with tales of miraculous cures attaching to his grave.¹ I assume him to be a historical character, as he is found in several places, but I do not know whether any actual record of him survives.

Many other names might be quoted, which I assume to have belonged of old to real persons, often probably tribal ancestors unknown to fame: e.g. Sinan Pasha² and Hadji Omar or Omar Baba: the latter two names I suppose to belong to one personage, though they are used at different places.

3. The *dede* or nameless heroized ancestor is spoken of at various places. In many cases his name has been entirely lost, but in other cases inquiry elicits the fact that the *dede* belongs to Class 2, and that some of the villagers know his name, though the world in general knows him only as the nameless *dede*, father of the tribe or settlement.

4. The word *dede* is also used in a still less anthropomorphic sense to indicate the mere formless presence of divine power on the spot. Many cases hang doubtfully between this class and the preceding: it is not certain whether the *dede* once had a name and a human reality which has afterwards been lost, or whether from the beginning he was merely the rude expression of the vague idea that divine power dwelt on the spot.

As an example the following may be selected. In the corner beneath the vast wall of Taurus, where Lycaonia and Cappadocia meet, at the head of a narrow and pic-

¹ I have observed the veneration of Karaja Ahmed at a village six hours S.S.W. from Ushak and about three hours N.W. from Geubek; also at a village one hour from Liyen and two from Bey Keui (one of several spots which divide the religious inheritance of the ancient Metropolis). At the latter, sick persons sit in the Turbe all night with their feet in a sort of stocks, and thus are cured.

² Many persons in Turkish history were called Sinan Pasha, the oldest being a Persian Mollah, mystic and scholar in the fourteenth century, one of three learned men, who were given the title Pasha (von Hammer, *Geschichte des Osman. Reiches*, i. p. 141, iv. p. 896 f.).

turesque glen, there flows forth from many outlets in the main mass of Taurus a river—for a river full grown it issues from the rock. Rushing down the steep glen, it meets at its foot a quieter stream flowing from the east through a rich soil, and long after the junction the clear water from the glen refuses to mix with the muddy water from the rich soil of the valley. The stream flows on for a few miles to the west, turning this corner of the dry Lycaonian plain into a great orchard, and there it falls into the Ak Göl (White Lake). The lake is one of those which vary greatly in extent in different years. In 1879¹ it reached close up to the rock-wall of Taurus, and flowed with a steady stream into a great hole in the side of the mountain. In 1882 and in 1890 it did not reach within a mile of the mountain-side.

This remarkable river has always been recognized by the inhabitants of the glen as the special gift of God, and about 800 B.C. they carved on a rock near the source one of the most remarkable, and even beautiful, monuments of ancient days, figuring the god presenting his gifts of corn and wine—whose cultivation the river makes possible—to the king of the country. The king is dressed in gorgeous embroidered robes, the god is represented in the dress of a peasant; he is the husbandman who, by patience and toil, subdues Nature for the benefit of man. This old conception evinces imagination, insight, poetic sympathy with Nature, and artistic power to embody its ideas in forms that appeal directly to the spectator's eye.

The modern peasantry recognize as fully as the ancients that the divine power is manifested here; they express their belief differently. The tree nearest the spring is hung with patches of rag, fastened to it by modern devotees. In

¹ This I learned from the late Sir Charles Wilson. Recently the scene has been carefully described by an Austrian traveller, Dr. Schaffer, in *Ergänzungsheft*, No. 141, to Petermann's *Geogr. Mittheilungen*.

the contrast between the ancient sculpture and the modern tree you have, in miniature, the difference between Asia Minor as it was 2,700 years ago, and Asia Minor as it is under the Turk. The peasants' language is as poor as their ritual. If you ask them why they hang their rags on the tree, the one explanation is "*dede var*" (there is a *dede*).

There can be little doubt that the idea of the sacred tree here is older than the sculpture. A sacred tree hung with little offerings of the peasantry was no doubt there before the sculpture was made, and has in all probability never been wanting in the religious equipment of the place. It has survived the sculpture, which has now no nearer relation to the life and thoughts of the people than the gods in the British Museum have to us, while the tree is probably a more awful object to the peasants than the village mosque.

The extreme simplicity of the peasants' way of expressing their religious idea is interesting; it is so contrasted with the manifold mythopoetic power of the Greek or Celtic races. It throws some light on their religious attitude to observe that in their topographical nomenclature there is the same dearth of imaginative interpretation of Nature. The nearest stream is commonly known as Irmak, the river, Su, the water, Tchai, the watercourse; half the population of a village know no other name for it, while the other half, more educated, know that it is distinguished from other streams as Kizil Irmak (red river), or Ak Su (white water), or Gediz Tchai (the stream that flows by the town of Gediz). The mountain beside the village is commonly termed simply "*dagh*"; if you ask more particularly, you learn that it is the "*dagh*" of such and such a village; if you ask more particularly still, you find that some one knows that it is Ala Dagh (the Spotted Mount), or Ak Dagh, or Kara Dagh (White or Black Mount). Very rarely does one find such a name as Ai Doghmush, the Moon Rising; a name that

admirably paints the distant view of a beautiful peak near Apamea-Celaenae, as it appears rising over some intervening ridge. The contrast between a name like this and the common Turkish names might suggest that it is a translation of an old pre-Turkish name. The same thought suggests itself for the Hadji-Baba, the Pilgrim Father, a lofty and beautiful mountain which overhangs the old city of Derbe.

Wherever the sacred building is connected with or directed by a regular body of dervishes, it is called a *teke*; where it is little more than a mausoleum, it is called a *turbe*. The most characteristic form of the *turbe* is a small round building with a sloping roof rising to a point in the centre and surmounted by the crescent; but it also occurs of various forms, degenerating into the meanest type of building. Often, however, there is no sacred building. The divine power resides in a tree or in a grove (as at Satala in Lydia, the modern Sandal), or in a rock, or in a hill. I cannot quote a specific case of a holy rock, though I have seen several; but of several holy hills the most remarkable occurs about two hours south-east from Kara Bunar, which probably is the modern representative of the ancient Hyde the Holy, Hiera Hyde. Here, within a deep circular depression, cup-shaped and about a quarter of a mile in diameter, there rises a pointed conical hill to the height of several hundred feet, having a well-marked crater in its summit. A small lake nearly surrounds the base of the hill. The ground all around is a mere mass of black cinders, without a blade of vegetation. I asked a native what this hill was called; he replied, "Mekke; Tuz-Mekkesi daiorlar" (Mecca; they call it the Salt-Mecca). Mecca is the only name by which the uneducated natives can signify the sacredness of a place.

In connexion with the maintenance of *tekes* and *turbes*,

we find an interesting case where the method of Roman law has survived through Byzantine times into Turkish usage. These religious institutions have been kept up by a rent charged on estates : the estates descended in private possession, according to the ordinary rules of inheritance, charged with the rent (*Vakuf*). The system is precisely the same as that whereby Pliny the younger provided a public school in his native city Novum Comum (Ep. vii. 18) ; he made over some of his property to the municipality, and took it back from them in permanent possession at a fixed rent (so far under its actual value as to provide for contingencies) ; and the possession remained with his heirs, and could be sold. This custom is the same as that which, according to Professor Mommsen, is called *avitum* in an inscription of Ferentinum (C.I.L. x. No. 5,853) and in one of the receipts found in the house of Caecilius Jucundus at Pompeii, and which is termed *avitum et patritum* in another of Cæcilius Jucundus's receipts (*Hermes*, xii. p. 123).

Much difficulty has been caused in Turkey owing to the rents having become insufficient to maintain the religious establishments. Many of the establishments, as, e.g., that of Seidi Ghazi at Nakoleia (now called Seidi Ghazi, after the hero), are rapidly going to ruin. The Government has made great efforts to cope with the difficulties of the case ; but its efforts have been only partially successful ; and many of the old establishments have fallen into ruins. It is only fair to remember and to estimate rightly the magnitude and difficulty of the task which the Government had to undertake. But the fact remains that the Evkaf Department is popularly believed to be very corrupt, and its administration has been far from good. It must, however, be acknowledged that in the last few years the traveller observes (at least in those districts where I have been wandering) a very marked improvement in this respect.

There appear to be cases¹ in which the actual rites and forms, or at least the accompaniments, of a pre-Mohammedan and even pre-Christian worship are preserved and respected by Mohammedans. A few examples out of many may be given here :—

1. The Ayasma (any holy spring to which the Christians resort) is also respected by the Mohammedans, who have sometimes a holy tree in the neighbourhood. In general a Christian place of pilgrimage is much respected by the Turkish peasantry. At Hassa Keui, the old Sasima, in Cappadocia, the feast of St. Makrina on January 25 attracts not merely Christians from Konia, Adana, Caesarea, etc., but even Turks, who bring their sick animals to be cured.¹ Many great old Christian festivals are regarded with almost as much awe by the peasant Turks as by the Christians.

2. Iflatun Bunar ; springs with strange virtues and having legends and religious awe attached to them, are in some cases called by the name of the Greek philosopher Plato, which seems to imply some current belief in a magician Plato (like the mediaeval Virgil). One of these springs of Plato is in the acropolis of Iconium : the history of Iconium is not well enough known to enable us to assert that the spring was holy in former times, however probable this may be. Another is situated about fifty miles west of Iconium, and from the margin of the water rise the walls of a half-ruined little temple, built of very large stones and adorned with sculptures of a religious character, showing the sanctity that has attached to the spring from time immemorial. The sculptures belong to the primitive Anatolian period, which is generally called Hittite.

We may note in passing that Plato's Springs belong to the neighbourhood of Iconium, the capital of the Seljuk kingdom of Roum, where a high standard of art and civili-

¹ Carnoy et Nicolaides, *Traditions Populaires de l'Asie Mineure*, p. 204.

zation was maintained until the rise of the Ottoman Turks. The name of Plato probably was attached to the springs in the Seljuk period, when Greek philosophy was studied and perhaps Plato was popularly known as a wise man or magician (just as Virgil was the great magician of European mediaeval superstition and literature).

3. The Takhtaji, woodcutters and charcoal-burners, are not pure Mohammedans. Their strange customs have suggested to several independent observers the idea that they are aboriginal Anatolians, who retain traces of a religion older even than Christianity.¹ Nothing certain is known about their rites and the localities of their worship, except that cemeteries are their meeting-place and are by the credulous Turks believed to be the scene of hideous orgies.

The Takhtaji must be classed along with several other isolated peoples of the country, who retain old pre-Christian rites. They are all very obscure, poor and despised; and it is extremely difficult to get any information about them. A friend who has been on friendly terms with some of them from infancy told me that, however intimate he might be with individuals, it was impossible to get them to talk about their religious beliefs or rites. Two things, however, he had learned—one of which is, I think, unrecorded by other inquirers.² In the first place, there is a head or chief-priest of their religion, who resides somewhere in the Adana district, but makes visits occasionally to the outlying settlements—even as far as the neighbourhood of Smyrna (where my informant lives). This high-priest enters any house and

¹ See Humann and Puchstein, *Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien*. Mr. Hyde Clarke has long had this idea, which is, he says, fully proved by what he has seen and heard among the people. On their ethnological character see Von Luschan in Benndorf-Niemann, *Lykia*, vol. ii. My ideas were gained originally from Sir C. Wilson.

² E.g. Von Luschan in *Lykia* (Benndorf-Niemann, etc.), II., p. 186 ff., and Crowfoot, *Man*, Oct., 1901, p. 145 f.

takes up his abode in it as he pleases, while the owner concedes to him during his stay all rights over property, children and wives. This priest is evidently the old priest-king of the primitive Anatolian religion, who exercises in a vulgarized form the absolute authority of the god over all his people.

In the second place, my informant fully corroborated the usual statement about them, that their holy place—where they meet to celebrate the ritual of their cult—is the cemetery; but he had not been able to learn anything about the rites practised there. This again is a part of the primitive religion of the land. It is a probable theory,¹ that the early custom was “to bury the dead, not along the roads leading out from the city (as in Greece, and beside the great Hellenized cities of Anatolia), but in cemeteries beside or around the central Hieron.” “It may be doubted whether in old Phrygian custom there was any sacred place without a grave. Every place which was put under divine protection for the benefit of society was (as I believe) consecrated by a grave.” “The dead was merged in the deity, and the gravestone was in itself a dedication to the god.” In death the people of the Great Goddess returned to her, their mother and the mother of all life, and lay close to her holy place and home. “The old custom remains strong throughout Christian and Moslem time.” The grave of a martyr, real or supposed, gave Christian consecration to some of the old holy places. “Wherever a Moslem Turbe is built to express in Mohammedan form the religious awe with which the Moslem population still regards all the old holy places, there is always in or under it the grave of some old supposed Moslem hero, and a Moslem legend grows up, and divine power is manifested there with miraculous cures.”

4. The music and dancing of the Mevlevi dervishes have

¹ *Studies in [the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces]* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1906), p. 273 f.

much of the character of the old ritual of Cybele, toned down and regulated by the calmer spirit of the Mohammedan religion and of the Turkish character.

5. In the Hermus valley, in the neighbourhood of Sardis, are several villages in which dwell a strange people, who practise a mixed sort of religion.¹ In outward appearance they are Mohammedans. But the women do not veil their faces in the presence of men, and the two sexes associate freely together. This freedom is, of course, usual among many tribes of a nomadic character in Anatolia, Turkoman, Avshahr, Yuruk, etc., and is the perpetuation of primitive Turkish custom before the Turks came in contact with Semitic people and adopted the religion of Islam. But in the villages of the Hermus valley the freedom probably has a different origin, as the other characteristics of the people show. While the men bear only Mohammedan names, the women are said often to have such Christian names as Sophia, Anna, Miriam, etc. They do not observe the Moslem feast of Ramazan, but celebrate a fast of twelve days in spring. They drink wine, which is absolutely forbidden by the law of Mohammed; yet we were told that drunkenness is unknown among them and that they are singularly free from vice. They practise strict monogamy, and divorce is absolutely forbidden among them, which stands in the strongest contrast with the almost perfect freedom and ease of divorce among the Mohammedans. In the usual Turkish villages there is always a mosque of some sort, even if it be only a tumble-down mud hovel, between which and the ordinary houses of the villages the difference is hardly perceptible to the eye of the casual traveller; but in those villages of the Hermus valley there is no mosque

¹ The following sentences are quoted nearly *verbatim* from an account published by Mrs. Ramsay in the *British Monthly*, March, 1902, shortly after we had visited the place.

of any description. There is, however, a kind of religious official, called popularly "Kara-Bash," one who wears a black head-dress, who visits the people of the different villages at intervals, when they assemble in one of the houses. How these assemblies are conducted, our brief stay did not enable us to discover. Our informant, a Christian resident of Albanian origin, was quite convinced that these villagers were Christians with a thin veneer of Mohammedanism, and declared that "if there were no Sultan, missionaries could make them by the hundred come over to profess Christianity openly." He himself was in the habit of reading the New Testament to them privately, to their great satisfaction.

Some few of these details we were able to verify personally; but most of them rest on the authority of our informant, who is a perfectly trustworthy person.

The same situation for great religious centres has in many cases continued from a pre-Mohammedan, and even from a pre-Christian period. In some cases, as in great cities like Iconium, the mere continuity of historical importance might account for the continuity of religious importance; but in other cases only the local sanctity can explain it, for the political prominence has disappeared from many places which retain their religious eminence.

The fact which is most widely and clearly observable in connexion with the localities of modern religious feeling is that they are in so very many cases identical with the scenes of ancient life, and often of ancient worship. Every place which shows obvious traces of human skill and human handiwork is impressive to the ruder modern inhabitants. The commonest term to express the awe that such places rouse is *kara*. In actual usage *kara* (literally, *black*) is not much used to indicate mere colour. A black object is *siakh*; but *Kara Mehmet* means, not Mehmet with black complexion,

but big, or powerful, or strong, or dangerous Mehmet. Ancient sites are frequently called *kara* : thus we have Sanduklu, the modern town, and Kara Sanduklu, five miles distant, the site of the ancient Phrygian city Brouzos.

No village names are commoner in modern Turkey in Asia than Kara Euren, or Karadja Euren, and Kizil Euren. I have never known a case in which Kizil Euren marks an ancient site¹ ; whereas a Kara or Karaja Euren always, in my experience, contains remains of antiquity, and is often the site of an ancient city.

The awe that attaches to ancient places is almost invariably marked by the presence of a *dede* and his *turbe*, if not by some more imposing religious building ; and a religious map of Asia Minor would be by far the best guide to the earlier history of the country. Even a junction of two important ancient roads has its *dede* : for example, the point where the road leading north from the Cilician Gates forks from the road that leads west is still marked by a little *turbe*, but by no habitation. It must, however, be added, as I have since found out, that the old village Halala was probably situated there.

The exceptions to this law are so rare, that in each case some remarkable fact of history will probably be found underlying and causing it, and these exceptions ought always to be carefully observed and scrutinized ; some apparent exceptions turn out to be really strong old examples of the rule, as when some very insignificant mark of religious awe is absolutely the sole mark of modern life and interest existing upon an otherwise quite deserted site. Two ancient cities I have seen, and yet cannot actually

¹ The following quotations are from pp. 273 ff. of my *Studies in the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1906).

² The name usually marks some obvious feature of the modern village, e.g., reddish stones.

testify to the existence of an unbroken religious history on their sites—Laodicea on the Lycus, and Comana in Cappadocia—but in the latter case the construction of a modern Armenian village on a site where fifty years ago no human being lived has made such a break in its history, that very close examination would be needed to discover the proof of continuity. Both these cases are, perhaps, not real exceptions, but I have never examined them with care for this special purpose, for it is only in very recent times that I have come to recognize this principle, and to make it a guide in discovery.

If we go back to an earlier point in history, no doubt can remain that the Christian religion in Asia Minor was in a similar way strongly affected in its forms by earlier religious facts, though the unity of the Universal Church did for a time contend strenuously and with a certain degree of success against local variations and local attachment.

1. The native Phrygian element in Montanism has been frequently alluded to, and need not be described in detail. The prophets and prophetesses, the intensity and enthusiasm of that most interesting phase of religion, are native to the soil, not merely springing from the character of the race, but bred in the race by the air and soil in which it was nurtured.

2. A woman, who prophesied, preached, baptized, walked in the snow with bare feet without feeling the cold, and wrought many wonders of the established type in Cappadocia in the beginning of the third century, is described by Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea.¹ The local connexion did not interest Firmilian, and is lost to us.

3. Glycerius the deacon, who personated the patriarch at the festival of Venasa, in Cappadocia, in the fourth

¹ See Cyprian, Epist. 75, sec. 10.

century, was only maintaining the old ritual of Zeus of Venasa, as celebrated by the high-priest who represented the god on earth. The heathen god made his annual progress through his country at the same festival in which Glycerius led a ceremonial essentially similar in type to the older ritual. See my *Church in the Roman Empire*, ch. xviii.

4. The Virgin Mother at the Lakes replaced the Virgin Artemis of the Lakes, in whose honour a strange and enigmatic association (known to us by a group of long inscriptions and subscription lists) met at the north-eastern corner of the Lakes.¹

Other examples have been given in the paper already alluded to (EXPOSITOR, June and August, 1905).

5. The Archangel of Colossae, who clove the remarkable gorge by which the Lycus passes out of the city, no doubt was the Christian substitute for the Zeus of Colossae, who had done the same in primitive time: Herodotus alludes to the cleft through which the Lycus flows, but does not mention the religious beliefs associated with it.²

6. The Ayasma at Tymandos, to which the Christians of Apollonia still go on an annual festival, was previously the wonder-working fountain of Hercules Restitutor, as we learn from an inscription.

7. In numerous instances the legends of the local heathen deities were transferred to the local saints, to whose prayers were ascribed the production of hot springs, lakes, and other natural phenomena. The examples are too numerous to mention. Sometimes they enable us to restore with confidence part of the hieratic pagan legends of a district, as, for example, we find that a familiar Greek legend has been attached to Avircius Marcellus, a Phrygian historical figure of the second century, and he is said to have submitted to the jeers of the mob as he sat on a stone. We may feel

¹ *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces*, pp. 304-317.

² *Church in the Roman Empire before 180*, ch. xix.

confident that the legend of Demeter, sitting on the rock called ἀγέλαστος πέτρα and mocked by the pitiless mob, which was localized by the Greeks at Eleusis, had its home also in this district of Phrygia.

8. One of the most striking examples of religious continuity is the monastery of St. Chariton near Iconium. It is near the base of the holy mountain of St. Philip. In it are shrines of the Panagia, St. Saba, and St. Amphilochius, and a mosque to which the Turks resort, and to which the Tchelebi Effendi sends five measures of oil every year. The son of a Seljuk Sultan fell over the cliff here, and St. Chariton caught him and saved his life.

We can then trace many examples of the unbroken continuance of religious awe attached to special localities from the dawn of historical memory to the present day. What reason can be detected for this attachment? In studying this aspect of the human spirit in its attitude towards the divine nature that surrounds it, the first requisite is a religious map of Asia Minor. This remains to be made, and it would clear up by actual facts, not darken by rather hazardous theories (as some modern discussions do), a very interesting phase of history.¹

The extraordinary variety of races which have passed across Asia Minor, and which have all probably without exception left representatives of their stock in the country, makes Asia Minor a specially instructive region to study in reference to the connexion of religion with geographical facts. Where a homogeneous race is concerned, a doubt always exists whether the facts are due to national character—to use a question-begging phrase—or to geographical environment. But where a great number of heterogeneous races are concerned, we can eliminate all independent

¹ The observation and recording of all *turbes* may be urged on every traveller in Asia Minor, especially on the French students of the *Ecole d'Athènes*, from whom there is so much to hope.

action of the human spirit, and attain a certainty that, since races of most diverse character are similarly affected in this country, the cause lies in the natural character of the land.

One fact, however, is far too obvious and prominent to be a matter of theory. In a considerable number of cases the sacred spot has been chosen by the divine power, and made manifest to mankind by easily recognized signs. An entrance from the upper world to the world of death and of God, and of the riches and wonders of the underworld, is there seen. The entrance is marked by its appearance, by the character of the soil, by hot springs, by mephitic odours, or (as at Tyana) by the cold spring which seems always boiling, in which the water is always bubbling up from beneath, yet never overflows.

One fact, however, I may refer to in conclusion, on a subject on which more knowledge may be hoped for. Throughout ancient history in Asia Minor a remarkable prominence in religion, in politics, in society characterizes the position of women. Most of the best attested, and least dubious cases of *Mutterrecht* in ancient history belong to Asia Minor; and it has always appeared to me that the sporadic examples which can be detected among the Greek races are alien to the Aryan type, and are due to intermixture of custom, and perhaps of blood, from a non-Aryan stock whose centre seems to be in Asia Minor; others, who to me are friends and φίλοι ἄνδρες, differ on this point, and regard as a universal stage in human development what I look on as a special characteristic of certain races.

Herodotus speaks of the Lycian custom of reckoning descent through the mother, but the influence of Greek civilization destroyed this character, which was barbarian and not Greek, and hardly a trace of it can be detected surviving in the later period. Lycia had become Greek in the time of Cicero, as that orator mentions. When,

however, we go to regions remoter from Greek influence, we have more hope of discovering traces of the pre-Greek character, e.g. the inscriptions of a little Isaurian town, Dalisandos, explored two years ago by my friend Mr. Hogarth, seem to prove that it was not unusual there to trace descent through the mother even in the third or the fourth century after Christ.

Even under the Roman government, and in the most advanced of civilized cities of the country, one fact persisted, which can hardly be explained except through the influence of the old native custom of assigning an unusually high rank to the female sex. The number of women magistrates in Asia Minor is a fact that strikes one on the most superficial glance into the later inscriptions. A young French scholar has recently collected the examples with much diligence, and has explained them as the result of an ingenious scheme for wheedling rich women out of their money. I did not discover in the book any proof that the writer was joking.¹

In the Christian period we find that every heresy in which the Anatolian character diverged from the standard of the Universal Church was marked by the prominent position assigned to women. Even the Jews were so far affected by the general character of the land, that the unique example of a woman ruler of the synagogue occurs in an inscription found at Smyrna.²

We would gladly find some other facts bearing on and illustrating this remarkable social phenomenon. My own theory is that it is the result of the superiority in type, produced among the Greek race to a noticeable degree by the character of the country in the character of the women.³

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Pierre Paris, *De Feminis in Asianis Civitatibus*, Paris, 1891.

² See my *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 161, 345, 360, 375, 438, 452-9, 480.

³ *Impressions of Turkey*, pp. 49, 168, 258, 270 f.

OLD TESTAMENT NOTES.

A NEW theory of the date of Habakkuk is suggested by Duhm in his recently published commentary (Tübingen). Past criticism has started from the allusion to the Chaldeans, but objection is taken by Duhm to the redaction and textual emendation which is required on the view that the book belongs to a time shortly after the battle of Carchemish. This view also raises serious historical difficulties. The expression "bitter and hasty nation" (i. 6) could only be applied to the Chaldeans *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, and they can scarcely have been designated "hasty." The foe which Yahweh is sending is an unexpected one, whereas the Chaldeans had long been known to Judah, and their approach, in fact, had been viewed as a friendly relief. Finally, their faces are set *eastwards* (i. 9), and so long as it is believed that the invaders came from Babylon towards Judah, the wording is inexplicable. Consequently, Duhm looks for a period when writers could borrow from Micah or Jeremiah (ii. 9, 10, 12), when the internal condition of Judah would suit the language, and thus rejecting both the Chaldeans and the friendly Persians decides in favour of the *eastward* invasion of Alexander the Great. It is possible that the precise allusion to the Chaldeans is a gloss, otherwise, if the name of the enemy were known, כשדים should perhaps be emended to כתים or כתיים; comp. 1 Macc. i. 1, viii. 5. With this conclusion, we are to compare, further, his view of the date of Isaiah xiv. 29-32.

Baentsch's *Allorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus* (Tübingen) is, as the sub-title announces, a plea for a revision of the prevailing view of the development of Yahwism in Israel. He confesses in the Preface that it is an attempt

to swim against the stream ; it may be viewed, he admits, as a deplorable relapse ; but when a literary critic like Baentsch feels himself bound to state honestly conclusions which he recognizes to be contrary to the usually accepted results of literary criticism, it is evident that his plea deserves the most careful consideration. Perhaps, his plea should have been given a somewhat more elaborate dress than his short sketch allows. Baentsch has thoroughly assimilated all that has been taught by Winckler, Hommel, and Jeremias regarding the astral religion of the ancient Oriental world.¹ His first object, therefore, is to show that undercurrents of monotheism are to be found in Babylonia (especially in the priestly speculations, p. 27) and in Egypt (in the short-lived reform of Amenophis IV.). Palestine, in the nature of the case, can hardly have remained untouched by these currents ; and specific evidence forces him to accept the view that it was under Babylonian influence. Baentsch's next step is a discussion of the traits which distinguish Yahwism from the monotheistic tendencies which have been found to prevail (pp. 42-48). The rest of the book is devoted to a reconstruction of the history of Israelite monotheism (pp. 48-109).

Abram, a Babylonian, from Ur-Kasdim and Harran ; Joseph, in Egypt, son-in-law of the priest of On ; Moses, associated partly with Egypt and partly with Midian, a district in touch with Minaean culture—these are the three great figures which indicate the tendency of Israelite belief. The traditions of Abram himself point to Canaanite rather than to Israelite origin (p. 54)—the same may also be true of Joseph (p. 82)—and the lunar motives in the narratives of the former reveal no complete break with the old Babylonian astral religion (pp. 60, sqq.). Even later, the letter of Ahiyami (recently found at Taanach) shows that early

¹ On this new tendency in criticism, see EXPOSITOR, Jan. p. 93, seq.

monotheistic ideas continued (pp. 40, 57 seq.). The Minaeans had their moon-cult, and the names Sinai and Sin alone proclaim Babylonian influence in a district with which the Hebrew tribes were so intimately associated. Thus, Yahweh even in Sinai was a complex deity (p. 68), his relation to the moon-goddess Sin is a delicate problem (p. 73 seq.); and Baentsch argues that Yahweh from the first was partly astral, and partly (as a tribal god) a deity with purely ethical characteristics. To make Yahwism a practical religion, another factor is needed, and in the traditions of Moses—although of much later date (p. 83)—the required motive power is found.

Thus, Baentsch sketches on broad lines, though with rather a disregard for details and internal difficulties, the new reconstruction of Yahwism (see p. 104). It will be viewed with mixed feelings. If modern criticism has belittled the religion of the early Hebrew tribes (p. 79), has failed to grasp the rise of Yahwism (p. 105), has regarded the monotheism of the patriarchs as due to later theory (p. 53), or has underestimated the civilization of the inhabitants of Canaan, this is precisely what has been repeated frequently by those who are not literary critics. But Baentsch writes from what may be called the purely archaeological standpoint: "The culture of the ancient East," he remarks, "constituted a great, comprehensive and imposing unit of which Israel formed an organic part, to the extent that its history, culture and thought cannot be apprehended without taking this fact into account." This may or may not be true, it is at least evident that two considerations have to be borne in mind.

In the first place, such a proposition requires the most thorough investigation. *If* astral religion and all its concomitants spread into Palestine, we may be perfectly certain that the less remote features of Babylonian cult and thought

were not absent, and Delitzsch and his followers are right in their contention that Palestine was a Babylonian domain. On the other hand, it could have been under the influence of Babylonia without being touched by the monotheistic tendencies—priestly speculations, as they have been called. It is a problem which should be approached without prejudice, least of all should it be handled with the idea of substantiating “tradition,” since if we are to conclude that Palestine was thoroughly Babylonian, the legitimate inferences, however favourable to isolated details, will hardly be favourable to the great body of tradition as a whole.

Thus, in the second place, Baentsch begs the question and draws conclusions which he proceeds to force into the literary evidence. The natural interpretation of the Old Testament narratives in the light of criticism leads to inferences relating to Israel’s religion and history. The writings must reflect both the conditions of their age and the views which were held at different times or among different circles. The views may or may not have been historically correct, and external evidence (e.g. from Babylonia) might disprove their accuracy. But it is self-evident that a truer idea of the tendencies of Israelite thought will be obtained by continuous testing of the stages of criticism than by a reconstruction which assumes that the view taken by the Israelite writers must inevitably have been that which the Babylonian evidence has suggested. No one would contend that all the inferences from a criticism of the unmistakable phenomena in the Old Testament writings are final, or would hesitate to resign those which are proved to be untenable; but the test of any reconstruction is its ability to explain the stages in its growth and to account for the present form of the evidence, and by this must Baentsch’s structure be tested. Nevertheless, his book shows some very evident weak points in the usually

accepted reconstruction and will serve the purpose of stimulating inquiry in three directions: The extent of the influence of the surrounding civilizations upon the Israelites; the position of Canaan before and during the entrance of Israel; and the natural interpretation of the Old Testament evidence, including the criticism of the views held by the writers themselves regarding the worship of Yahweh.¹

STANLEY A. COOK.

¹ Here Baentsch is suggestive rather than conclusive. He does not appear to make sufficient allowance for the fact that the O.T. evidence is *Israelite*, and when he distinguishes between Canaanite and Israelite features he does not make it perfectly clear upon what grounds he bases his distinction. When it is recognized that much of that which is regarded as specifically Israel was common to Palestine (or to old Semitic usage), that is to say, was indigenous, it would seem to be more methodical, to test theories of *Israelite* religion by eliminating all that which is not distinctive. Incidentally, it may be added that Baentsch accepts the view that the ark was an empty throne (in accordance with the cosmological theory set forth by Dibelius). This, however, is far from being a certainty, and Budde deals fully with the question in an elaborate article in *Theolog. Stud. u. Kritiken*, July.

PROFESSOR HARNACK ON LUKE.

It has for some time been evident to all New Testament scholars who were not hide-bound in old prejudice that there must be a new departure in Lukan criticism. The method of dissection had failed. When a real piece of living literature has to be examined, it is false method to treat it as a corpse, and cut it in pieces : only a mess can result. The work is alive, and must be handled as such. Criticism for a time regarded the work attributed to Luke as dead, and the laborious autopsy was utterly fruitless. Nothing in the whole history of literary criticism has been so waste and dreary as great part of the modern critical study of Luke. As Professor Harnack says on p. 87 of his new book,¹ "All faults that have been made in New Testament criticism are gathered as it were to a focus in the criticism of the Acts of the Apostles."

The question "Shall we hear evidence or not ?" presents itself at the threshold of every investigation into the New Testament.² Modern criticism for a time entered on its task with a decided negative. Its mind was made up, and it would not listen to evidence on a matter that was already decided. But the results of recent exploration made this attitude untenable. So long as the vivid accuracy of Acts xxvii., which no critic except the most incompetent

¹ *Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1906.

² The bearing of this question is discussed in the opening paper of the writer's *Pauline Studies*, 1906.

failed to perceive and admit, was supposed to be confined to that one chapter, it was possible to explain this passage as an isolated and solitary fragment in the patchwork book. But when it was demonstrated that the same life-like accuracy characterized the whole of the travels, the theory became impossible. Evidence must be admitted. All minds that are sensitive to new impressions, all minds that are able to learn, have become aware of this. The result is visible in Professor Harnack's book. He is willing to hear evidence. The class of evidence that appeals to him is not geographical, not external, not even historical in the widest sense, but literary and linguistic; and this he finds clear enough to make him alter his former views, and come to the decided conclusion that the Third Gospel and the Acts are a historical work in two books,¹ written, as the tradition says, by Luke, a physician, companion in travel and associate in evangelistic work of Paul: this conclusion he regards as a demonstrated fact (*sicher nachgewiesene Tatsache*, p. 87). It does not, however, lead him to consider that Luke's history is true; and he argues very ingeniously against attaching any high degree of trustworthiness to it, and hardly even admits that the early date which he assigns to it compels the admission that it is more trustworthy than the champions of its later date would or could allow. That is the only impression which I can gather (see p. 504), from the Author's language. On the other hand, in his notice of his book (*Selbstanzeige*),² he speaks far more favourably of Luke's trustworthiness and credibility, as being generally in a position to transmit reliable information, and as having proved himself able

¹ He hints at the possibility that a third book may have been intended by Luke, but never written. See below, p. 499f.

² In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (edited by himself and Professor Schürer), July 7, 1906, p. 404.

to take advantage of his position. I cannot but feel that there is a certain want of harmony here, due to the fact that the Author was gradually working his way to a new plane of thought.

Some years ago I reviewed in this magazine Professor McGiffert's arguments on the Acts.¹ The American Professor also had felt compelled by the geographical and historical evidence to abandon in part the older criticism. He also admitted that the Acts is more trustworthy than previous critics allowed; he also was of opinion that it was not thoroughly trustworthy, but was a mixture of truth and error; he also saw that it is a living piece of literature written by one author. But from the fact that Acts was not thoroughly trustworthy, he inferred that it could not be the work of a companion and friend of the Apostle Paul; and he has no pity for the erroneous idea that the Acts could have failed to be trustworthy if it had been written by the friend of Paul. I concluded with the words: "Dr. McGiffert has destroyed that error, if an error can be destroyed." But what is to Professor McGiffert inadmissible is the view that Professor Harnack champions.

In the following remarks Professor Harnack will generally be spoken of simply as "the Author," in order to avoid reiteration of the personal name.

The careful and methodical studies of the language of Luke by Mr. Hobart² and Mr. Hawkins³ have been thoroughly used by the Author. He mentions that Mr. Hawkins seems to be almost unknown in Germany (p. 19), and expresses the opinion (p. 10) that Mr. Hobart's book would have produced more effect, if he had confined himself to

¹ The review is republished in revised form in *Pauline Studies*, 1906: the quotation here given is from p. 321 of that book.

² *Medical Language of St. Luke*, Dublin, 1882.

³ *Horae Synopticae*, 1899.

the essential and had not overloaded his book with collections and comparisons that often prove nothing. I doubt if this is the reason that Mr. Hobart's admirable and conclusive demonstration has produced so little effect in Germany. The real reason is that the Germans, with a few exceptions, have not read it. That many of his examinations of words prove nothing, Mr. Hobart was quite aware ; but he intentionally, and, as I venture to think, rightly, gave a very full statement of his comparison of Luke's language with the medical Greek writers. It is the completeness with which he has performed his task that produces such effect on those who read his book. He has pursued to the end almost every line of investigation, and shown what words do not afford any evidence as well as what words may be relied upon for evidence. The Author says that those who merely glance through the pages of Mr. Hobart's book are almost driven over to the opposite opinion (as they find so many investigations that prove nothing). This description of the common German "critical" way of glancing at or entirely neglecting English works which are the most progressive and conclusive investigations of modern times suggests much. These so-called "critics" do not read a book whose method and results they disapprove : the method of studying facts is not to their taste, when they see that it leads to a conclusion which they have definitely decided against beforehand.

The importance of this book lies in its convincing demonstration of the perfect unity of authorship throughout the whole of the Third Gospel and the Acts. These are a history in two books. All difference between parts like Luke i. 5-ii. 52 on the one hand, and the "We"-sections of Acts on the other hand—to take the most absolutely divergent parts—is a mere trifle in comparison with the complete identity in language, vocabulary, intentions, interests, and

method of narration. The writer is the same throughout. He was, of course, dependent on information gained from others : the Author is disposed to allow considerable scope to oral information in addition to the various certain or probable written sources ; but Luke treated his written authorities with considerable freedom as regards style and even choice of details, and impressed his own personality distinctly even on those parts in which he follows a written source most closely.

This alone carries Lukan criticism a long step forwards, and sets it on a new and higher plane. Never has the unity and character of the book been demonstrated so convincingly and conclusively. The step is made and the plane is reached by the method which is practised in other departments of literary criticism, viz., by dispassionate investigation of the work, and by discarding fashionable *a priori* theories.

Especially weighty is the evidence afforded by the medical interest and knowledge, which marks almost every part of the work alike. The writer of this history was a physician, and that fact is apparent throughout. The investigations of Mr. Hobart supply all the evidence—I think the word “all,” without “almost,” may be used in this case—on which the Author relies. Never was a case in which one book so completely exhausts the subject and presents itself as final, to be used and not to be supplemented even by Professor Harnack. It is doubtless only by a slip, but certainly a regrettable slip, that the Author, in his notice of his own book published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, makes no reference to Mr. Hobart, though he mentions other scholars from whose work he has profited.

The Author has up to a certain point employed the plain, simple method of straightforward unprejudiced investigation into the historical work which forms the subject of his

study, a method which has not been favoured much by the so-called critical scholars of recent time. So far as he follows this simple method, which we who study principally other departments of literature are in the habit of employing, his study is most instructive and complete. But he does not follow it all through ; if we read his book, we shall find many examples of the fashionable critical method of *a priori* rules and prepossessions as to what must be or must not be permitted. *Multa tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis*. These are almost all of the one kind. Wherever anything occurs that savours of the marvellous in the estimation of the polished and courteous scholar, sitting in his well-ordered library and contemplating the world through its windows, it must be forthwith set aside as unworthy of attention and as mere delusion. That method of studying the first century was the method of the later nineteenth century. I venture to think that it will not be the method of the twentieth century. Professor Harnack stands on the border between the nineteenth and the twentieth century. His book shows that he is to a certain degree sensitive of and obedient to the new spirit ; but he is only partially so. The nineteenth century critical method was false, and is already antiquated. A fine old crusty, musty, dusty specimen of it is appended to the Author's *Selbstanzeige* by Professor Schürer, who fills more than three columns of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, July 7, 1906, with a protest against the results of new methods and a declaration of his firm resolution to see nothing that he has not been accustomed to see: "These be thy gods, O Israel."

The first century could find nothing real and true which was not accompanied by the marvellous and the "supernatural." The nineteenth century could find nothing real and true which was. Which view was right, and

which wrong? Was either complete? Of these two questions, the second alone is profitable at the present. Both views were right—in a certain way of contemplating; both views were wrong—in a certain way. Neither was complete. At present, as we are struggling to throw off the fetters which impeded thought in the nineteenth century, it is most important to throw off its prejudices and narrowness. The age and the people, of whatever nationality they be, whose most perfect expression and greatest hero was Bismarck, are a dangerous guide for the twentieth century. In no age has brute force and mere power to kill been so exclusively regarded as the one great aim of a nation, and the one justification to a place in the Parliament of Man, as in Europe during the latter part of the nineteenth century; and in no age and country has the outlook upon the world been so narrow and so rigid among the students of history and ancient letters. We who study religion owe it to the progress of science that we can begin now to see how hard and lifeless our old outlook was; but we who were brought up in the nineteenth century can hardly shake off our prejudices or go out into the light. We can only get a distant view of the new hope. Professor Harnack is in that position. He is one of the first to force his way out into the light of day; but his eyes are still dazzled, and his sight imperfect. He sees that Luke always found the marvellous quite as much in his own immediate surroundings, where he was a witness and an actor, as in the earliest period of his history; but he only infers, to put it in coarse language, “how blind Luke was.”

What was the truth? How far was Luke right? I cannot say. Consult the men of the twentieth century. I was trained in the nineteenth, and cannot see clearly. But of one thing I am certain: in so far as Professor Harnack

condemns Luke's point of view and rules it out in this unheeding way, he is wrong. In so far as he is willing to hear evidence, he comes near being right.

Practically all the argument, in the sense of facts affording evidence, stated by the Author has long been familiar to us in England and Scotland. What is new and interesting and valuable is the ratiocination, the theorizing, and the personal point of view in the book under review. We study it to understand Professor Harnack, not to understand Luke : and the study is well worth the time and work. Personally, I feel specially interested in the question of Luke's nationality. On this the Author has some admirable and suggestive pages.

That Luke was a Hellene is quite clear to the Author. He repeats this often ; and if once or twice it looks as if he were leaving another possibility open, that is only from the scientific desire to keep well within the limits of what the evidence permits. He has no real doubt. The reasons on which he lays stress are utterly different from those which have been mentioned by myself in support of the same conclusion, but certainly quite as strong if not stronger ; it is a mere difference of idiosyncrasy which makes him lay stress on those that spring from the thought and the inner temperament of Luke, while I have spoken most of those which indicate his outlook on the world and his attitude towards external nature. But just as I was quite conscious of the other class and merely emphasized those which seemed to have been omitted from previous discussions of the subject,¹ so the Author's silence about the class which I have mentioned need not be taken as proof that he is insensible to such reasons. But those reasons do not appeal much to the mind of one who has not lived long in the country and has not felt the sense impressions from

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 21, 205 ff.

whose sphere they are taken. Perhaps they are apt to seem fanciful to the scholar who has spent his life in the library and the study.

The sentimental tone and the frequent allusion to weeping, which is characteristic of Luke, is characteristic also of the Hellene: *dort und hier sind die Tränen hellenische* (p. 25). Mark and Matthew have hardly any weeping: there is more in John; but Luke far surpasses John. Such ideas and words as ὑβρις, βάρβαροι, are characteristically Greek. "Justice did not suffer him to live" is exactly the word of a Hellenic poet.¹ To Pindar or Aeschylus Justice and Zeus are almost equivalent ideas.

In an extremely interesting passage, p. 100 f., the Author sketches the character of Luke's religion. He recognizes with correct insight the fundamental Hellenism of Luke's Christianity. To put the matter from a different point of view, Luke had been a Hellenic pagan, and could not fully comprehend either Judaism or Christianity. As in Ignatius, so in Luke, we see the clear traces of his original pagan thought,² and we detect the early stage of the process which was destined to work itself out in the paganization of the Church. The world was not able to comprehend Paulinism, and the result of this inability to understand the spiritual power was the degrading of the spiritual into pagan personal deities as saints. It was not possible for even Luke to spring at once to the level of Paulinism; that would need at the best more than a single life, even supposing that there had been unbroken progress. As it happened, there was a degeneration in the level of thought and com-

¹ Acts xxviii. 4: the words are put in the mouth of the Maltese barbarians, but they are only the expression by Luke of their remarks and attitude to Paul; and they are the Hellenized thought of a Hellene.

² I do not mean to imply that the Author expresses such an opinion about Luke; he pictures Luke's idea as a definite hard fact; to me it always comes natural to regard a man's ideas as a process of growth, and to look before and after the moment. The Author isolates the moment.

prehension, after the first impulse communicated by Jesus had apparently exhausted itself, until the Christian idea had time slowly to mould the world into the position of comprehending it better.

I confess, however, that the Author, while he catches this undeniable fact about Luke's religious comprehension, seems to miss the elements in his view that were capable of higher development. These were only germs, and the weakness of the Author's view seems to be that he recognizes only the fully articulated opinion and is sometimes blind to ideas which were merely inchoate. Hence I cannot but regard the estimate (on p. 101) of Luke's Paulinism, i.e. of his failure to grasp Paulinism, as too hard and too thin. But, with this qualification, the passage on p. 100 f. appears to me to be most illuminative and remunerative. We are really trying to say the same thing, but expressing it through the colouring and transforming medium of our different personalities, and I too imperfectly: as regards the Hellenism of Luke the difference between us is one merely of degree. The really important matter is this: in the first place, we both see clearly and perfectly and finally the first century character of Luke's thought: "He has come into personal relations with the first Christians, with Paul" (p. 103). In the second place, the Author's view that Luke was so totally incapable of comprehending the spirit of Christianity—for that inevitably is implied in his exposition pp. 100–102—only brings out into clearer light his inability to have evolved from his inner consciousness the picture of Jesus which looks out in such exquisite outline from his historical work. The picture was given to him, not made by him; and the Author himself shows plainly how it was given him. He had intimate relations with some of those who had known Jesus, and from that, more than from the early written accounts to

which he also had access, he derived his conception. Where he altered this conception, it could only be to introduce his own ideas and his want of real comprehension. I do not at all deny that there are traces in his Gospel and the other Gospels of the age and the thoughts amid which they were respectively composed ; but these are recognized because they are inharmonious with the picture as a whole. They are stains, and not parts of the picture.

Accordingly, in spite of certain difference, so close does this part of the task bring us, starting from our widely opposed points of contemplation, that the conclusion of this brilliant passage is the first expression of Paul's general position in the Jewish and Hellenic world, as Harnack conceives it, that I am able to adopt and to use as my own. " Paul and Luke are counterparts.¹ As the former is only intelligible as a Jew, but a Jew who has come into the closest contact with Hellenism, so the latter is only intelligible as a Hellene, but a Hellene who has personally had touch with the original Jewish Christianity." Usually, in his characterization of Paul, the Author sees the Jew so clearly, that he sees nothing else. Here he recognizes the very close contact of Paul with Hellenism. Has that contact been so utterly devoid of effect on an extremely sensitive and sympathetic mind, as the Author often represents it to have been ? To me it seems that, while Luke was the Hellene, who could never understand or sympathize with the Jew,² Paul was the Jew who had sympathized with much that lay in Hellenism and had been powerfully modified and developed thereby, remaining however a Jew, but a developed Jew, " who had come into the closest contact with Hellenism."

In the familiar argument about the " We " - Passages of

¹ *Gegenbilder*, companion and contrasted pictures.

² *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 207.

Acts, the Author puts one point in a striking and impressive way. In these "We"-Passages, as he points out and as is universally recognized, Luke distinguishes carefully between "We" and Paul. Wherever it is reasonably possible, in view of historic and literary truth, he emphasizes Paul and keeps the "We" modestly in the background. Now, take into account the narrative in Acts xxviii. 8-10, "And it was so that the father of Publius lay sick of fever and dysentery : unto whom Paul entered in and prayed, and laying his hands on him healed him. And when this was done, the rest also which had diseases in the island came and were cured [more correctly, 'received medical treatment'] : who also honoured us with many honours."

In this passage attention is concentrated on Paul, so long as historic truth allowed ; but Paul's healing power by prayer and faith could not be always exercised. Such power is efficacious only occasionally in suitable circumstances and on suitable persons. As soon as it begins to be exercised on all and sundry, it begins to fail, and a career of pretence deepening into imposture begins. When the invalids came in numbers, medical advice was employed to supplement the faith-cure, and the physician Luke became prominent. Hence the people honoured not "Paul," but "us."

Here the Author recognizes a probable objection, but considers it has not any serious weight : viz. that Luke, like Paul, may have cured by prayer and not by medical treatment. Against this he points to the precise definition of Publius's illness, which is paralleled often in Greek medical works, but never in Greek literature proper ; and argues that faith-healers do not trouble themselves, as a rule, about the precise nature of the disease which is submitted to them. He acknowledges that this is not a complete and conclusive answer. He has strangely missed the real

answer, which is complete and conclusive. Paul healed Publius (ἰάσατο), but Luke is not said to have healed the invalids who came afterwards. They received medical treatment (ἐθεραπεύοντο). The latter verb is translated "cured" in the English Version; and Professor Harnack agrees. Now in the strict sense ἐθεραπεύοντο, as a medical term, means "received medical treatment"; and in the present case the context and the whole situation demand this translation (though Luke uses the word elsewhere sometimes in the sense of "cure"): the contrast to ἰάσατο, the careful use of medical terms in the passage, and above all the implied contrast of Paul's healing power and Luke's modest description of his medical attention to his numerous patients from all parts of the island, all demand the latter sense. Professor Knowling is here right.

The Author states a careful argument that, since Luke and Aristarchus are twice mentioned together in the Epistles of Paul and Aristarchus is thrice mentioned in the Acts, the silence of Acts about Luke is to be explained by the fact that he wrote the book, and there is no other explanation possible. Aristarchus, an unimportant person, is mentioned in Acts solely because he was in relation with Luke. Luke did not name himself, though he frequently indicates his presence by using the first person. Luke and Aristarchus were Paul's two sole Christian companions on his voyage to Rome. These facts, the triple reference in Acts to a person so unimportant in history as Aristarchus, and the silence about Luke except in the editorial "we," point to Luke as the author.

This argument occurs or appeals to every one who approaches the book with a desire to understand it; it carries weight; but the weight is lessened by the enigmatic silence of Acts about Titus, a person of such importance and so closely alike in influence to Luke. He who solves that enigma

will throw a flood of light on the early history of Christianity in the Aegean lands. A conjecture is advanced in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 390 ; and as yet I see no other way out of the difficulty, since the only other supposition that suggests itself—viz., that Titus Lucanus was the full name of the author, and that he was sometimes spoken of as Titus simply, sometimes as Lukas (an abbreviated form)—introduces apparently greater difficulties than it solves.

The attempt on pp. 15–17 to demonstrate that the writer of Acts was closely connected with Syrian Antioch, seems to me a distinct failure. That Luke had some family connexion with Syrian Antioch¹ is in perfect harmony with the evidence of his writings, and must be accepted on the evidence of Eusebius and others ; but the proof that this in any way influenced his selection and statement of details is anything but convincing. A false inference seems to be drawn in some cases. For example, it is pointed out (p. 16, note 1) that Syrian Antioch is only once alluded to in the Pauline letters (Gal. ii. 11), whereas it is often mentioned in a peculiar and emphatic way in Acts ; and the inference is drawn that the emphasis laid on Antioch in Acts cannot be explained purely from the facts and must be due to some special interest which Luke felt in it. This reasoning implies that the importance of different places in the early history of Christianity can be estimated according to the frequency with which they are mentioned in Paul's letters. Without that premise the Author's reasoning in the note just quoted has no validity ; but the premise needs only to be formally stated, and its falsity is at once evident.

In the view which I have tried to support, the reason why Syrian Antioch is often mentioned in Acts is simply and solely its critical and immense importance in the development of the early Church. In Antioch were taken

¹ On the character of this connexion, see Note at the end.

the first important steps in the adaptation of the Church to the pagan world ; for the episode of Cornelius does not imply such a serious step, and would have been quite compatible with the maintenance of a Judaic Church of a free and generous fashion.

The reason why Antioch is rarely mentioned by Paul is that his letters are not intended to give a history of the development of the Church, but to warn or to encourage his correspondents. Only in Galatians i., ii. does Paul diverge into history, and there Antioch plays an extremely important part. It is the scene of action from Galatians i. 21 (where Syria means Antioch) down to ii. 1, and again ii. 11-14.

The Author's further suggestion that Mnason the Cypriote,¹ whom Paul and his companions found living at a town between Caesarea and Jerusalem, may have been the missionary from Cyprus that helped to found the Church in Antioch (p. 16, n. 2), has absolutely nothing in its favour, and is an example of the sort of vague "might have been" which annoys and irritates the plain matter-of-fact English scholar, but which is extremely popular among the so-called "Higher Critics" abroad and at home. Those suggestions of utterly unproved and improbable possibilities lead to nothing, and should never be made (as here) buttresses for an argument. It is founded on the observation that among the Antiochian leaders mentioned in xiii. 1, no Cypriote occurs.² Professor Harnack has forgotten that the first of the list, the outstanding leader of the Antiochian Church, Barnabas, was a Cypriote ; and, though he was not one of the missionaries who helped in the original foundation, he came to Antioch immediately after the foundation ; and there is no reason to assume that the five leaders mentioned in xiii. 1 must include all the original founders.

¹ At Jerusalem, as the Author thinks, assigning no value to Western readings.

² *Ein Cyprier wird nicht genannt.*

The imagined contrast between the importance attached to Syrian Antioch in Acts and Paul's comparative silence about it, is strengthened by the quotation of Acts xiv. 19 as a reference—a confusion of Syrian with Pisidian Antioch, evidently a mere slip, but a slip into which the Author has been betrayed by eagerness to find arguments for a theory.

Not much better seems to me the inference drawn from the first speech of Jesus (Luke iv. 21–27), which begins with “this parable, Physician, heal thyself,” and ends with a reference to Naaman, the Syrian. In this the Author finds conclusive proof that Luke was a physician, and that he was keenly interested in Antioch. What connexion has Damascus with Antioch? True, we now speak of them both as in Syria. But Syria was not a country. There was no unity between Damascus and Antioch from any point of view when that speech was delivered, and as little when Luke composed his history. The two cities were in different countries, under different rule, far distant from one another, and having no relation with one another. One was the capital of a Roman Province, the other was subject to the barbarian king of Arabia.

The cases in which I find myself obliged to disagree with the Author are generally of one class, and are due to the fact that he frequently regards as indicative of Luke's individual character details which are forced on the historian by his subject. Examples are numerous. We have some in the Author's attempt to prove that Antioch had a special interest for Luke as his birthplace. On p. 106 he attempts similarly to show that Ephesus had a special interest for him, and is specially marked out among the Churches by him; in this he finds a proof that Luke settled and wrote either at Ephesus or in a district for which Ephesus had a central significance, and he adds that this country may

have been Achaia. Why Ephesus should have a central significance for one who resided in Achaia is not easy to see,¹ except in the sense that it had a central significance for the Gentile Church in general. This special interest which Luke had in Ephesus is proved (1) by the heartfelt tone of affection in which Paul addresses the elders of Ephesus ; (2) by the way in which Paul's address on that occasion is turned into a general farewell to the congregations of the Aegean district ; (3) that he knows and takes notice of the later history of the Ephesian Church.

The facts seem to me only to illuminate Paul's feeling towards Ephesus and to mark out Luke's report as being a trustworthy account of an address which was really delivered ; Luke sinks and Paul alone emerges in the report. The farewell to Ephesus was at some points expressed as a general farewell, because his audience included representatives of all the Churches, in Achaia, Macedonia, Asia and Galatia ; and though these representatives were accompanying him to Jerusalem, yet, when he was explaining that he intended to come no more into those regions (having, as we know, Rome and the West now in view), it seems only natural that at this point he should begin to speak more generally, "Ye all, among whom I went about preaching, shall see my face no more." This is said to all the congregations, Corinth, etc., which were absent but represented by delegates, who would report his farewell. Considering Paul's past experience elsewhere, it is not strange that he should be able to foresee that dangers from without

¹ It is rather inconsistent with this that in a footnote on the same page the Author says that, while Acts shows clearly that the foundation of the congregation at Corinth was the principal achievement of Paul's second journey, yet Luke himself had no relation to this Church. How it could have been possible to settle in Achaia and yet not come into any relation to Corinth, but regard Ephesus as the point of central significance for his district, I cannot in the circumstances of the Roman period understand.

and dangers from within awaited Ephesus. The Author has just pointed out that the address had already become general; why, then, does he assume that this sentence 29-30 applies only to Ephesus, and shows such a knowledge of later Ephesian history as proves the subsequent acquaintance with, perhaps actual residence in, Ephesus of the historian who composed the address and put it into the mouth of Paul? It might equally plausibly be argued, on the contrary, that this sentence shows ignorance of subsequent Ephesian history, for both John and Ignatius agree that Ephesus was long the champion of truth and the rejecter of error.¹

In general one feels that, where the Author is at his best, he is studying Luke in a straightforward way and drawing inferences from observed facts; where he is less satisfactory, he has got a theory in his head, and is straining the facts to support the theory.

The tendency to regard historical details which Luke narrates as indicative of his personal character often takes the form of blaming the historian for being inconsistent, where the inconsistency (if it be such) was the fault of the facts, not of the narrator. I quote just one example. In xvi. 37 Paul appeals to his Roman rights as a citizen: "one asks in astonishment why he does so only now." One may certainly be quite justified in asking the question, but one is not justified in blaming Luke because Paul did not do so sooner. There are some clear signs of the unfinished state in which this chapter was left by Luke; but some of the German scholar's criticisms show that he has not a right idea of the simplicity of life and equipment that evidently characterized the jailer's house and the prison.² The details which he blames as inexact and incon-

¹ *Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 240 f.

² *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 220 ff.

sistent are sometimes most instructive about the circumstances of this provincial town and colonia.

The Author lays much stress on the fact that inconsistencies and inexactnesses occur all through Acts. Some of these are undeniable ; and I have argued that they are to be regarded in the same light as similar phenomena in Lucretius, for example, viz., as proofs that the work never received the final form which Luke intended to give it, but was still incomplete when he died. The evident need for a third book to complete the work, together with those blemishes in expression, form the proof. Below, p. 499 f.

But the Author finds inconsistencies and faults in Luke where I see none. He complains that Luke is not disturbed by the fact that Paul was driven on by the Spirit to Jerusalem, and yet the disciples in Tyre through this same Spirit seek to detain him from going to Jerusalem. I cannot feel disturbed any more than Luke ; and I can only marvel that the great German scholar thinks we ought to be disturbed by it. Still less can I blame Luke (as the Author does, p. 81) because Agabus's prophecy, xxi. 11, is not fulfilled exactly as it is uttered. Luke is merely the reporter of what he heard Agabus say ; and we can only feel profoundly grateful that he recorded the simple facts, and did not adapt the prophecy to the event.

But it is never safe to lay much stress on small points of inexactness or inconsistency. One finds such faults even in the works of modern scholarship, if one examines them in the microscopic fashion in which Luke is studied here. I think I can find them in the Author himself. His point of view sometimes varies in a puzzling way. On p. 92 the paragraph Acts xxviii. 17-31 is said to be clearly modelled for the conclusion of the whole work. On p. 96 the Author confesses his inability to solve the serious problem presented by the last two verses, and suggests the possibility that

Luke intended to write a third book. Again, on p. 20 he numerates xx. 5, 6 as part of the "We"-sections, but on p. 105 f. he declares that Luke first met Paul at Troas, accompanied him to Philippi, and there parted from him, to rejoin him after some years, and in fact the meeting took place once more at Troas. But if the reunion only took place at Troas, then xx. 5, 6 cannot be a genuine part of the "We"-sections.

I suspect that inexactness on the Author's part forms the foundation for a charge which he brings against me. He speaks of my theory that Luke was employed by Paul as a physician during his severe illness in Galatia. If I have so spoken it would be a clear example of inexactitude and inconsistency on my own part. I entirely agree with Professor Harnack that Paul first met Luke in Troas, and that Luke never travelled with Paul in Galatia; and I think this is put quite clearly and strongly in my book, *St. Paul the Traveller*. I may elsewhere have been guilty of this inexactitude and inconsistency; but I cannot remember to have made such a statement. I have doubtless spoken of Luke as being useful as a medical adviser to Paul in travelling, as e.g. I have said that Luke would have discouraged any proposal to walk sixty miles in two days (Acts xxi. 16),¹ more especially since Paul was liable to attacks of fever; but his fever was not confined to Galatia or to any one journey. Moreover, a traveller may be guided by his physician's advice, even though the physician does not accompany him.

There is an object in thus dwelling on the inconsistencies and inexactitudes of which Luke is guilty. Professor Harnack is here preparing to cope with the supreme difficulty in Acts, viz. the disagreement between the narrative of Acts xv. and that of Galatians ii. 1-11, if these are taken (as

¹ *Pauline and other Studies* (1906), p. 267.

the Author takes them) to be accounts of the same event, or series of events. These are so plainly and undeniably inconsistent with one another—for the denial which some scholars even yet express is one of the strange things in the history of learning—that, if they depict the same incident, one must be fatally inaccurate. Now, as Paul was present and took part in the incident, his evidence must rank higher, unless he be condemned as intentionally misrepresenting facts, a theory which few adopt and which need not be considered. Luke then must be wrong, where he is in disagreement with Paul. The disagreement can be readily explained by those who regard Acts as the work of a later period history, as they may reasonably say, had become dimmed by lapse of time, by the growth of prejudice, and by various other causes. But how can those explain it, who maintain (as the Author does) that Acts was written by the friend, coadjutor and personal 'attendant of Paul, the friend of many other persons closely concerned and certain to possess good information? The inconsistency is not in unimportant details, easily caught up differently by different persons: the inconsistency is fundamental and thorough.

To that question the Author has to prepare his answer; and his answer is that Luke was habitually inaccurate and inconsistent with himself. This answer is always a difficulty, against which the Author is struggling with extraordinary dialectic skill throughout his book, but the struggle is vain and success impossible. Luke is not, in the Author's exposition, a single character. He is a double personality, good and bad.

The truth is, as has frequently been pointed out, that the whole problem which governs so completely and so disastrously this and most modern books about Acts is a mere phantom, the creation of geographical ignorance, the

result of the irrational North Galatian view. Acts xv. describes a different scene from Galatians ii. 2-11.

On p. 106 f. the Author discusses the very evident relation between Luke and the Gospel of John, and points out that of all the Apostles Luke shows interest in none but Peter and John. That this greater frequency of reference to these two might be due to their greater importance in the development of Christianity as the religion of the Empire (which I hold to be the truth) is set aside without even a passing glance by the Author. The reason must lie in some accidental meeting of Luke with, or personal relation to, John. It is quietly assumed from first to last that the determining motive of Luke in his choice of events for record or omission lies in personal idiosyncrasy or caprice, never in the real importance or unimportance of the events. The Author says that, considering his predilection for John, it is remarkable that Luke does not mention him in Acts xv., when Paul shows in Galatians ii. that John was one of the three prominent figures in the incident; and the only inference which he draws is that Luke had not read the letter to the Galatians. But, even if that inference were true, it would not be a sufficient explanation, for Luke had abundant opportunity of learning the facts and the comparative authority of the various Apostles from other informants; and the Author fully grants that he made considerable use of oral information. The only justifiable inference which the mere commonplace historian would permit himself to draw is that, according to the information at Luke's disposal, John did not play a prominent part in the incident described in Acts xv., whereas he was prominent in the scene described by Paul (Gal. ii. 2-10).

The view which at present commends itself to me (but which might, of course, be altered by more systematic consideration) is that the writer of the Fourth Gospel knew the

Third, but that the writer of the Third did not know the Fourth and had little acquaintance with its author. The analogies which Professor Harnack points out are of subject, forced on both by external facts, and not caused by personal influence.

It sounds, at first hearing, strange to us that the Author feels himself as the first to observe that the female element is so much emphasized in Luke, whereas Mark and Matthew give women very small place in the history.¹ This seems such a commonplace in English study, that I felt obliged to be almost apologetic and very brief in referring to the subject in *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (pp. 83-90). Yet when one's attention is called to the fact, it is not easy to refer to any formal and serious discussion of this extremely important side of the evidence about Luke's personality; and it may be that the Author is the first, at least in modern German scholarship, to treat the topic in a scholarly way. The truth seems to be that German scholars have been so entirely taken up with the preliminary questions, such as "Was there a Luke at all?" that they have never tried to discover what sort of man he was. Even those who championed his reality were so occupied in proving it by what are considered more weighty arguments, that they forgot the mode of proof which seems in my humble judgment to be far the strongest, viz., to hold up to the admiration of all thinking men this man Luke in his humanity and reality. Do his works reveal to us a real man? If so, they must be the genuine composition of a true person; no pseudonymous work ever succeeded or could succeed in exhibiting the supposititious writer as a real personality. Professor Harnack has only half essayed

¹ *Worauf, soviel ich mich erinnere, bisher noch nie aufmerksam gemacht worden ist. . . . Erst Lukas hat sie [i.e. Frauen] so stark in die evangelische Geschichte eingeführt.* But see above, p. 482 f.

the task. He has entered on it, but never heartily, for he is too much cumbered by prepossessions, by old theories only half discarded, and above all by the hopeless fetters of the North-Galatian prejudice, which inevitably distorts the whole history (above, p. 501 f.).

I have pointed out, in the passage above quoted (p. 90), that this attitude of Luke's mind is characteristic of Macedonia (implying thereby that it is not characteristic of Greece proper): I might and should have added Asia Minor. But there is much to say on this subject, and here I can only refer to the discussion of the place in subsequent Christian development filled by the Anatolian craving for some recognition of the female element in the Divine nature (*Pauline and other Studies*, 1906, pp. 135 ff.).

"The traditions of Jesus, which lie before us in the works of Mark and Luke, are older than is commonly supposed. That does not make them more trustworthy, but yet is not a matter of indifference for their criticism."¹ So says the Author on p. 113. These are not the words of a dispassionate historian; they are the words of one whose mind is made up *a priori*, and who strains the facts to suit his preconceived opinion. In no other department of historical criticism except Biblical would any scholar dream of saying, or dare to say, that accounts are not more trustworthy if they can be traced back to authors who were children at the time the events which form this subject occurred, and who were in year-long, confidential and intimate relations with actors in those events, than they would be if they were composed by writers one or two generations younger, who had personal acquaintance with few or none of the actors and contemporaries. But compare above, p. 482.

¹ *Die Ueberlieferungen von Jesus, die bei Markus und Lukas vorliegen, sind älter als man gewöhnlich annimmt. Das macht sie nicht glaubwürdiger, ist aber doch für ihre Kritik nicht gleichgültig.*

There is room, and great need, for a dispassionate and serious examination of the question how far there exist in the Gospels real traces of the period in which they were composed, and of the thought characteristic of that time. Such an examination cannot be conducted to a useful end by one who begins with his mind made up as to what must be later and what cannot be real, for such prejudices must inevitably be of nineteenth century character and hostile to any true comprehension of first century realities. I cannot but think and maintain that there are later elements in the Gospels, showing the influence of popular legend, and reminding us that after all the picture of Jesus which stands before us in the New Testament has always to be contemplated through glass that is not perfect and flawless, through a human and imperfect medium.¹ The flaws can be distinguished, but the marvel is that they are so few and so unimportant. The picture is so strong, so simple in outline, and so unique, that it shines with hardly diminished clearness through the medium.

NOTE.—A word must be added about the meaning of Eusebius's statements as to Luke's origin, τὸ μὲν γένος ὦν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας. In *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 389, I expressed the opinion that this peculiar phrase, used in preference to one of the simple ways of saying that he was an Antiochian or resided at Antioch, amounted to an assertion that he did not live in Antioch, but belonged to an Antiochian family. Professor Harnack does not say anything that conflicts with my statement (so far as I have observed), though he does not formally agree with it, and, on the whole, rather neglects it; quite probably he may never have observed it. But several others have disputed

¹ Legend gathers quickly in the East. It is an interesting study to observe how the historic figure of Ibrahim Pasha has been hidden beneath a crust of legend in the districts of Asia Minor which he held from 1832–40. The name is famous, but the legends gather round it.

it, and asserted that Eusebius describes Luke as an Antiochian. Some parallel passages will show that I was right; had Luke been known to Eusebius as an Antiochian himself, the historian would not have said that "by family he was of those from Antioch." Arrian, *Ind.* 18, mentions Nearchos, son of Androtimos, τὸ γένος μὲν Κρής ὁ Νέαρχος, ὥκει δὲ ἐν Ἀμφιπόλει τῇ ἐπὶ Στρώμονι (compare *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1896, p. 471). Nearchos was by family a Cretan, but he resided in Amphipolis, where probably his father settled, and where the son could only be a resident stranger, not a citizen:¹ hence he continued to be "Cretan by family, settled in Amphipolis." Similarly we find in an epitaph of Olympos in Lycia Telesphoros, son of Trophimos, γένει Πρυμνησεῶς,² a resident in Olympos and married to an Olympian woman (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1892, p. 224). As resident strangers acquired no citizenship, it was necessary to have some method of designating them in the second or third generation: had Telesphorus himself migrated from Phrygian Prymnessios, he would have been called Πρυμνησεὺς οἰκῶν ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ (*Cities and Bish. of Phr.* ii. p. 471), or more formally, after the analogy of C.I.G. 2686, οἰκήσει μὲν Μειλήσιος, φύσει δὲ Ἰασέυς. Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 7, 2, speaks of Simon resident in Caesareia Stratonis as Ἰουδαῖον, Κύπριόν δὲ γένος.

The form ἀπὸ Ὁξυρύγχεως, etc., is used in the Egyptian Papyri apparently in the sense of "belonging to Oxyrynchos, etc.," without any implication that the person was not resident there; but in this expression the critical word

¹ Unless an act of the Macedonian king forced the conferring of citizenship.

² Personally I should regard Πρυμνησεῶς as the better accentuation: the form is due to rough and coarse local pronunciation of Greek, often exemplified in inscriptions of Asia Minor: many examples of this are quoted in writings on Asia Minor of recent date, e.g., κατεσκειύσαν for κατεσκεύασαν, where *ον* must be regarded as a representation of the sound of *W*. In Πρυμνησεῶς it represents either *W* or the modern pronunciation *F*. See e.g. *Histor. Geogr. of As. Min.* p. 281; *Studies in Eastern Prov.* (1906), p. 360.

γένος is omitted: examples are numerous, e.g., Ἀλοίνης, Κώμονος, Διονυσίου, τῶν ἀπὸ Ὁξυρύγχων πόλεως, Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyr.* No. 48, 49.

The form τῶν ἀπὸ is also used in a way different from the last example, equivalent to ἐκ τῶν: e.g. ὑπὸ Νεφέριτος τῶν ἀπὸ Μέμφεως, *Greek Papyri Br. Mus.* p. 32 (Nepheris was resident in Memphis); compare also Κάστορος . . . τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης Ἀκώρεως καταγεινομέν[ου]¹ ἐν κώμῃ Μνάχει, *Amherst Papyri*, 88. In the second case Castor was not a resident in his proper village: in the former case it is possible that the formula is used in a papyrus of the Serapeum, because Nepheris was at the moment at the Serapeum outside of Memphis. But I do not venture to make any statement about Egyptian usage. Literary usage certainly has a distinguishing sense for τῶν ἀπὸ, e.g. Σεβήρος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἄνωθεν Φρυγίας, Aristides, i. p. 505 (Dindorf): this Roman officer of high rank belonged to a Jewish family of Upper Phrygia and also of Ancyra, but he evidently was not a resident in Upper Phrygia, and at the period in question he was probably not even educated in Upper Phrygia, but in Italy, as he was able to enter the senatorial career when a youth.

The expression τῶν ἀπὸ is also used in the sense of 'descended from a person,' e.g. τῶν ἀπ' Ἀρδυος Ἡρακλειδῶν (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* 1892, p. 218), "of the Heracleids descended from Ardys," the Lydian king.

Fränkel, *Inscr. Perg.* i. p. 170, takes the phrase appended to a royal letter, Ἀθηναγόρας ἐκ Περγάμου, as meaning that Athenagoras the scribe was not a Pergamenian citizen, but a resident only. But the meaning is, "Athenagoras (was the scribe: the letter was written) from Pergamos."

W. M. RAMSAY.²

¹ ω in pap.: corrected to [ου] by the editors.

² The Author dates Luke's History A.D. 80. For a different reason I argued that Luke iii. 1, was written under Titus, 79-81 (*St. Paul the Traveler*, p. 387).

THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

THERE are not many passages in the New Testament which are so rich in difficulties of all kinds as the incident of the sick man at the Pool of Bethesda, and the resolution of the difficulties has been unusually slow and protracted. In the first place, the problem presented by the text which describes the incident was sufficiently complex; there appeared to be at least three strata of textual deposit upon the original narrative; and although there was a fair consensus amongst the critics as to the duty of removing the references to the descent of the angel, and the descriptions which have gathered round the descent, and which are comprised in the various traditions of the fourth verse of the fifth chapter of John, there was still a residual disagreement as to whether we ought to remove altogether the reference to the moving of the water which commonly stands at the end of the third verse, and leave the narrative to stand with a statement of a gathering of sick people at the pool, and no reason why they should be there, except what is disclosed in a subsequent conversation in the seventh verse. Nor was it agreed, in the next place, what the pool was named; nor, until quite recently, where it was topographically to be recognized. Dean Burgon, in his first attack on the Revised Version, made much sport of the various spellings of the name of the pool, and counts them up ironically, though perhaps this is no great assistance to the critic who wants to know what the name really was; but then it is not much better, on the other hand, to follow the method of the modern disciples of Dr. Hort, who imagine they have advanced the science of textual criticism and settled a difficult problem by writing Bethzatha for Bethesda.

If the place to which the incident referred was, until

recently, hard to identify, it was still more difficult to decide what was the time to which the miraculous healing was to be referred. An examination of the commentaries upon St. John will show that the unnamed "feast of the Jews" to which our Lord went up has been located at almost every festal centre in the Jewish calendar; and here the uncertainty was even more irritating than that which attached to the name and place of the pool, for the solution had a bearing upon the number of passovers in the Johannine account of our Lord's ministry, and so upon the chronological duration of His period of active service. I hope to be able, *inter alia*, to throw some light upon the time at which the miracle was wrought, in the course of the present paper.

After the questions of text, time and place have been settled, if they can be finally settled, we have to face the miracles involved, and here also there is a good deal of perplexity. I do not mean simply the miracle produced by our Lord's word; this miracle is only the top stratum on a legendary deposit of miracle: whatever the angel did or did not, the people came to the pool for healing, and it is not sufficient to say that it was an intermittent spring, or that there was iron in the water. The fact is that, on any showing, we are face to face with an Asiatic Lourdes; the angel is the healer in the one case, just as the Blessed Virgin is in the other; they are put there by legend makers more or less honest; but even Lourdes is a problem of psychology, apart from the question whether the Blessed Virgin consecrates the waters or not; and Bethesda has still to be studied on the side of the supposed healings, even when we have dissected the angel out of the text.

It was intimated above that progress had been made on the archaeological side of the question. The pool, which had moved about the city much in the same way as the

feast had run round the calendar, was run to earth (literally) in an excavation some years since in the north-east corner of Jerusalem, which brought to light not only the pool with its five arches, but the memorial church built over it in early times, with five dummy arches in its north wall and an interesting fresco of the angel stirring up the water, which at all events might assure us that the received text, when the church was built, had its proper accretion on the side of supernatural machinery. I was in Jerusalem in the month of January, 1889, not long after the discovery of this interesting church and the pool beneath it, and the impression made upon my mind was that, however doubtful many of the accepted Jerusalem sites may be, here was something which was the best identification of all those that could claim any degree of acceptance. For it is certain that this is the pool described by the pilgrim of Bordeaux in A.D. 333, and almost as certain that it is the pool described in the Gospel of John. The conclusion is an important one in its bearing upon the question whether the author of the Fourth Gospel was personally acquainted with Jerusalem! But I do not wish to diverge into that question at present. What I propose to do is to take the text of the first verses of the fifth chapter of John, print them in a modern editorial form, and then, at the side, print the account of the angel as a marginal gloss. Assuming the gloss to be uncanonical, I shall prove it to be of the nature of folk-lore, and perhaps identify the angel; the question must then be asked whether this folk-lore gloss is pure imagination on the part of some ingenious scribe or whether it may fairly be taken to represent the opinions of the people who came to the pool for healing as to the way in which the miracle was commonly accomplished. For convenience we will print the Westcott and Hort text in this way, *plus* the gloss, and it will be seen

at once that the interpretation of the gloss has a real weight in the interpretation of the text, that is, if the gloss were a correct record of contemporary opinion. But even if it belong textually to a later historical period, if we can show that it is genuine folk-lore, it may still be valid evidence for interpreting the story, because folk-lore is not like textual accretions, which have nothing corresponding to them in the original text ; we are practically certain of the antiquity of a folk-lore element, even when we cannot be certain of the antiquity of the text that carries it. The importance of this consideration is often overlooked by those whose chief study lies in written documents.

We have then the following text and accompanying gloss :

JOHN V.

JOHN V.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. ἔστιν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολύμβηθρα ἣ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθζαθά,</p> <p>3. πέντε στοῦς ἔχουσα· ἐν ταύταις κατέκειτο πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενούντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν.</p> <p>5. ἦν δέ τις ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ αὐτοῦ. τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατακείμενον, καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἔχει, λέγει αὐτῷ.</p> | <p>4. ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν· ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ καὶ ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν παραχρὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὑγίης ἐγένετο ὧς δῆποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι.</p> |
|---|--|

Now the marginal comment which we have printed brings at once into relief, that the supposed troubling of the water was regarded as *an annual phenomenon* ; the early fathers saw that this was involved in *κατὰ καιρὸν* and interpreted accordingly. But if this be a correct comment, it makes an end of the theory of the intermittent spring, and almost as certainly of the rationalistic explanation of a healing chemical virtue in the water. If the

pool of Bethesda is the parallel of Lourdes, it is Lourdes on a particular day of the ecclesiastical year, such as, let us say, the Assumption of the Virgin. And now for the proof that this *is* folk-lore, and that from another point of view, it can be seen to have nothing to do with hydrostatics or chemistry !

In the year 1903 I crossed the centre of Asia Minor from Persia to the Mediterranean, and spent some time in the city of Harpoot and its neighbourhood. In the plain of Harpoot (a very rich and fertile plain containing scores and scores of villages, once prosperous enough, but now much devastated by Turkish oppression and misgovernment) there is a village named Habusu, which is on New Year's night the scene of a peculiar practice of some early cult. On this night the water of the village pool is believed to be stirred up by an angel, and the angel is identified with Gabriel. The result of his descent is that the waters become sanific. All the population, both Turkish and Christian with the exception of the Protestants, who regard the practice as superstitious, go out at midnight to bathe in the consecrated pool. On the previous afternoon the water is dammed up, so as to leave a greater space for bathing. Some people carry off the consecrated water in pitchers and buckets to their houses at the stroke of midnight ; they believe that if they catch it at the right moment, when the angel descends, it will turn to gold and silver.

Here, then, I had stumbled upon a close parallel to the gloss in the fifth chapter of John : here was the crowd of people watching the water for the elect moment when the angel should descend, the supposition of healing virtue, the annual miraculous display, and instead of the first man that stepped in being healed, there was the suggestion of material wealth for the one that collected the water at the right moment. It was only a variation of wealth in the

place of health. No doubt the angel could do either grace or both.

The first suggestion that arose in one's mind was that perhaps the custom might have arisen from some pious feeling provoked by the reading of the Scripture : in that case it would be artificial folk-lore for the plain of Harpoot, but not what we commonly denote by the term. But it need scarcely be said that the improbability of the suggestion is on its very face. Customs do not arise that way in any ordinary community : we have innumerable examples of old customs varied to suit the requirements of a change of religion, very few of deliberate invention. Moreover, it was clearly a very old custom, for otherwise the Turks and the Christians would not be keeping it side by side. And it could hardly have been influenced by an early Armenian Gospel text, for in the oldest of these the legendary passage is wanting.

But there was another consideration which proved that the hypothesis of borrowing was unequal to explain the facts.

There is a famous Burmese festival, when the King of the Nats, or Burmese angels, descends to inaugurate the New Year. The festival takes place at midnight, and is described as follows by Monier Williams : " When the day arrives, all are on the watch, and just at the right moment, which occurs invariably at midnight, a cannon is fired off, announcing the descent of the Nat-king upon earth. Forthwith men and women sally forth out of their houses, carrying pots full of water consecrated by fresh leaves and twigs of a sacred tree, repeat a formal prayer and pour out the water on the ground. At the same time all who have guns of any kind discharge them, so as to greet the New Year with as much noise as possible. Then, with the first glimmer of light, all take jars of water, and

carry them off to the nearest monastery. First they present them to the monks and then proceed to bathe the images."

The account goes on to say that when they have drenched the Buddhas and Bodhisatvas the water-throwing becomes universal ; and it is quite evident that from these features alone we could determine that it was a water festival whose object is to secure fertility in the year upon which the people have just entered. I need not enlarge on this point, nor illustrate further the bathing of images of saints and the throwing of water. Such rain charms are still practised in many parts of Europe.

But now we have to compare this festival with the custom of the Armenian villagers, and we shall see that the parallels are striking. The descent of the King of the Nats answers to the descent of Gabriel ; the time is the same, the midnight of the new year ; and the carrying of jars of holy water occurs in both centres, though there is some difference of detail in the method of consecration of the water, and the Burmese angel is not said to descend into a pool or fountain. The parallels are sufficient to prove that the Burmese and Armenian customs are related pieces of folk-lore, and that the object aimed at is the same, the securing of fertility for the lands by sympathetic magic on New Year's Day. And since it cannot be held that the Burmese have borrowed anything from the Gospel of John, the only conclusion is that from three separate quarters we have come upon the traces of a primitive water festival. We may put down some of the points in a parallel diagram.

| <i>Jerusalem.</i> | <i>Armenia.</i> | <i>Burmah.</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| A festival not named, and a popular gathering almost certainly annual. | A new-year festival. | A new-year festival. |
| An angel descends. | The archangel Gabriel descends. | The King of the Nats descends. |

Jerusalem.

The instant is not specified.

The place is a sacred pool, or a pool that becomes sacred.

Healing virtue appears in the waters for the first man that takes advantage of the descent.

Nothing about carrying off the holy water.

Armenia.

The time is midnight.

The place is a pool that becomes sacred.

Healing virtue appears in the waters: and the waters turn to gold and silver, for the lucky people who catch them at the right moment.

The holy water is carefully collected.

Burmah.

The time is midnight.

It is not said to be a descent of the King of Nats into a pool.

The water is a charm for fertility.

The consecrated water is used for ritual purposes, and for throwing on one another.

Assuming these parallels to be valid, we have established our statement that the gloss in John is a folk-lore gloss, and we may surely say that the festival in the mind of the writer was the Jewish new-year festival (*Rosh Ha-shanah*). Was the glossator right? It is agreed that the folk-lore was not his own invention; he must have drawn from very early primitive custom still extant in his own day, and it is beginning to look as if he were giving us correct comment, for it has been shown that the folk-lore, or the main elements of it, are very ancient, whatever may be the date of the written gloss.

Let us then see what can be said for the supposition of a New Year's Festival at the Pool of Bethesda, from the point of view of the critics. Let us turn to Westcott's Commentary on John. He points out how perplexed the Church Fathers have been over the identification of the festival. "It has been identified with each of the three great Jewish Festivals—the *Passover* (Irenaeus, Eusebius, Lightfoot, Neander, Greswell, etc.), *Pentecost* (Cyril, Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel, etc.), and the Feast of *Tabernacles* (Ewald, etc.). It has also been identified with the Day of *Atonement* (Caspari),

the Feast of *Dedication* (Petavius ?), and more commonly in recent times with the Feast of *Purim* (Wieseler, Meyer, Godet, etc.).”

Westcott then endeavours to make out the proper sequence of the events in the early chapters of John, and examines which of the Jewish Festivals fits in best with the scheme for the beginning of John v. Then he makes the following statement :

“It is scarcely likely that the *Day of Atonement* would be called simply a festival . . . but the *Feast of Trumpets* (the new moon of September) which occurs shortly before, satisfies all the conditions that are required. This ‘beginning of the year,’ ‘the day of memorial’ was in every way a most significant day. . . . On this day, according to a very early Jewish tradition, God holds a judgment of men (Mishnah, Rosh Ha-shanah, § 11 and notes); as on this day He had created the world. . . . In the ancient prayer attributed to Rav (second century) which is still used in the Synagogue service for the day : ‘This day is the day of the beginning of Thy works, a memorial of the first day.’ . . . And on the provinces it is decreed thereon; ‘This one is for the sword, and This for peace; This one is for famine, and This for plenty!’”

So it seems that we have come to the same conclusion as Westcott with regard to the day of the Bethesda miracle. This is very valuable confirmation, on either side : and it will be possible now to go on with more confidence in the historical treatment of the events recorded in John. Notice in passing the allusion of the Jewish prayer book to the determination which is made on New Year’s Day as to whether it is to be a year of peace and plenty or of war and famine ; and compare what was said above as to the connexion of the Water Festival with annual fertility,

We may say further that, if the glossator has given us

a story of a New Year's Water Festival and some of the popular beliefs about it, he must have been in close touch with Jerusalem, either by residence or by visiting the place, or he must have drawn on Jerusalem sources. Scribes out of Palestine are hardly likely to have been able to make such an addition. It is a Palestinian gloss, and I can imagine some one asking me whether I am quite sure that it is a gloss at all. Here, again, Westcott's comment is very striking: "the words from *waiting for . . . he had* are not part of the original text of St. John, but form a very early note added to explain, v. 7, *while the Jewish tradition with regard to the pool was still fresh.*" The words italicized are very near to my own statement that the gloss must have had a Palestinian origin.

There are several other questions which at once present themselves if this view be accepted. It will be a question to examine in connexion with what has been said whether the New Year's Day and the Sabbath fell together about this time, for the Fourth Gospel is very decided that the events it relates occurred on a Sabbath. It is to be inquired in what relation the New Moons of September and Sabbaths stand to one another. But this I cannot at present throw any light upon.

Inquiry must also be made on a line suggested by Westcott, whether and how far the Jewish ritual of the New Year has influenced the discourses of the Fourth Gospel between our Lord, the man he had healed and his opponents, the Pharisees. But this also I cannot treat with advantage at present. If it is really conceded that the New Year is the Festival of John v., we shall have taken a forward step in the understanding of the Gospel.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

STUDIES IN THE "INNER LIFE" OF JESUS.

XVII. THE FOREGLEAMS OF THE GLORY.

(1) IN the consciousness of Jesus, the foreshadowings of the Cross, with which the *Last Study* dealt, were ever accompanied by foregleams of the glory that should follow. On each occasion when He announced His passion, He also intimated His resurrection (Matt. xvi. 21 ; xvii. 23 ; xx. 19) : " the third day He shall be raised up." Although we have only the bare statement of this expectation, yet doubtless the thoughts of Christ dwelt as much on the foregleams as on the foreshadowings. How did He conceive both His death and His resurrection ? Although on the one hand His consciousness of God as Father, and His consequent function of Revealer of God's Fatherhood, might at first sight appear to involve a knowledge and an insight regarding death and the Hereafter transcending the common human limitations, yet, on the other hand, His consciousness of oneness with the sinful and mortal race, and His consequent function as the Redeemer of mankind from sin and death by tasting death as the curse of sin for every man, on closer view demands that death should be to Him a mystery and a terror as to other men, and that the hopes He cherished in facing death should be hopes that faith in God might suggest to other men. Had there been given to Him a clear and full vision of the coming glory, could death have been the dread and the dark reality that it was, as Gethsemane and Calvary prove ? As has been repeatedly suggested, He nourished His own inner life with the study of the Holy Scriptures. There too in the experience of the saints of God foregleams of the glory burst through the foreshadowings of the gloom of death. The belief that in Sheol " there is no remembrance of God," and that the

fellowship even of the saints with God is interrupted by death, gradually yielded to the faith that God's beloved cannot become death's prey, but that the glorious vision of, and the blessed communion with, God of His saints will be continued in the unseen world. The Psalmist who can confidently say to God, "I have no good beyond Thee," whose delight is in "the saints that are in the earth," can face death with the assurance—

My heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth :
 My flesh also shall dwell in safety.
 For Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol ;
 Neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy one to see corruption ;
 Thou wilt show me the path of life :
 In Thy presence is fulness of joy ;
 In Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore."

(Ps. xvi.).

Another psalmist contrasts himself with "the men of the world, whose portion is in this life." While "they are satisfied with children, and leave the rest of their substance to their babes," his hope is, "As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness, and shall be satisfied, when I awake, with Thy likeness" (Ps. xvii.). Surely in Christ's filial consciousness there sprang up the same glorious, blessed hope.

(2) The common belief of Judaism seems, however, to have been that both saints and sinners would go to Hades, although the saints would be comforted in Abraham's bosom, and the sinners be in torments in Gehenna (Luke xvi. 22, 23) ; and only after the general resurrection would their final and complete separation take place, and the saints enter into the fulness of their blessedness and glory in Paradise. A few exceptions were made. Enoch, Moses and Elijah were commonly believed to have passed at once to Paradise. May we venture to suggest that the thoughts of Jesus lingered around these contrasted expectations, an

immediate and a delayed entrance into the Divine Presence ; and that He asked Himself whether to accomplish His work in giving His life a ransom for many, and in offering the sacrifice of the new covenant, it would be necessary for Him to pass to Hades, to experience with sinners, if only for a moment, the interruption of the glorious vision of, and the blessed communion with God, which, with the saints of old, was His one good on earth ? His agony in Gethsemane and His desolation on the Cross seem to show the necessity of that experience, which He passed through, however, and out of which He was delivered before death. (But this experience will be the subject of subsequent *Studies*.) Even when He made the first announcement of His Passion, He had the assurance of a speedy victory over death. Yet it is probable that His mind wavered between the hope of the Psalmists, which according to the common belief was fulfilled in only a few exceptional cases, and the popular expectations. Could He, the beloved Son, expect with Enoch, Moses and Elijah to pass at once into the Paradise of the Divine Presence, or was it needful for Him, with His other brethren, to pass into Hades, the realm of the dead ?

(3) If, as we have a right to conjecture, His thoughts thus moved about among the expectations of the Hereafter that came to Him from the Holy Scriptures, and the common beliefs of His own age and people, might not another suggestion present itself to His mind ? In the Holy Scriptures it was recorded that " Enoch walked with God, and He was not ; for God took him " (Gen. v. 24) ; that " God buried Moses in the valley in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor ; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day " (Deut. xxxiv. 6) ; that " Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven " (2 Kings ii. 11). In each departure there was mystery, an exception to the common lot. Would it be altogether inconceivable that Jesus, in thinking of

death, meditated on these departures, and even entertained the possibility of His being taken to God in some such way as had been these saints of the old covenant ?

(4) Assuredly it is much more certain that He dwelt much on the necessity of His death as the fulfilment of law and prophecy. His description of His death at the Last Supper as the sacrifice of the new covenant shows that while the ritual system of Judaism did not hold any prominent place in His thought, or His teaching, yet it was not for Him without some significance as a feature of the divine revelation which in His sacrifice was to find fulfilment. It has been already argued in dealing with the *Baptism of Jesus* (*Fourth Study*) that He found the ideal of Saviourhood which He sought to realize in the Servant of Jehovah, depicted in Isaiah liii. Thus in his death prophecy too would find fulfilment. Nor were the two lines of anticipation quite apart, for God is represented as making the soul of the Servant "an offering for sin" (Heb. a guilt offering, R.V. marg.). It was possible for Jesus to look at His death without any contradiction from both standpoints.

(5) With these thoughts, beliefs, wishes, aims, hopes, fears, Jesus withdrew from the company of His disciples, and took only three, Peter, James and John, "the inner circle," to a high mountain apart. While the companions, whom probably, as at Gethsemane, He had chosen to watch with Him, as in His solitude with God He craved the sympathy of man (to anticipate a point which must afterwards be more fully explained), were "heavy with sleep," He "was praying." (These two details of the narrative which Luke alone records, possess the highest degree of probability, even if we may not say, certainty, ix. 29, 32.) The content of His prayer is not recorded, but we may infer the filial petition from the paternal response. He desired the certainty of escape from the gloom of Hades to the

glory of Paradise. The token and the pledge of His blessed and glorious resurrection from death to God was given in a foretaste of its fruition. "He was transfigured before them ; and His face did shine as the sun, and His garments became white as the light. And behold there appeared unto them Moses and Elijah talking with Him " (Matt. xvii. 2-3). Mark, whom we may suppose to transmit the account of one of the eye-witnesses, Peter, adds no distinctive trait, except that he describes the garments as "glistening, exceeding white ; so as no fuller on earth can whiten them " (ix. 3). Luke adds another detail as probable or certain as the two already mentioned. Moses and Elijah "appeared in glory, and spake of His decease (departure, R.V. marg., Gr. *ἔξοδον*) which He was about to accomplish in Jerusalem " (ix. 30, 31). Although, as would appear from Luke's account, the disciples were not fully awake when this vision appeared to them, the description is from their point of view, and there is no direct evidence that Jesus afterwards filled in from His own knowledge what had been lacking for their sight and hearing ; yet it does seem probable that it was He who informed them that the two men were Moses and Elijah, and that the subject of their converse was "His decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem," for it is difficult to understand how they discovered these details in their confused and alarmed state of mind. (Regarding Peter's proposal to build three tabernacles, Mark explains, "He wist not what to answer ; for they became sore afraid " ; and Luke, "not knowing what He said.") While the vision is thus described in its effect on the disciples, it would seem a serious mistake to assume that Jesus was not Himself a sharer in the experience, that He was not Himself conscious of being transfigured, or of holding converse with Moses and Elijah appearing in glory ; for what has been so

far advanced justifies the assumption that He, in view of His death, needed this assurance even as did His disciples.

(6) It is not within the scope of these *Studies* to examine closely and thoroughly what may be called the metaphysics of this event. We have not the data which would enable us to answer decisively the question whether the transfiguration was, to use the scholastic distinction in the doctrine of transubstantiation, in the substance or in the accidents of the person of Christ ; or whether Moses and Elijah were really present, or only appeared both to Christ and His disciples to be present. (It would be, in the writer's judgment, an unwarranted emphasis on a word, if the word *μετεμορφώθη*, used by Matthew and Mark, were held to settle the problem.) The writer's own philosophy does not compel him to exclude the possibility of the most objective conception of the event ; but it seems to him that the requirements of the narrative are met by regarding the whole scene as a "divinely caused vision" (Sanday's *Outlines on the Life of Christ*, p. 128) in which both Christ and His disciples participated.

(7) Assuming, then, that we may regard the Transfiguration as an *objective vision*, in contrast to subjective hallucinations, we may, in accord with the aim of this series, seek to discover the psychological conditions of the vision. Just as Jesus demanded faith as the condition of His working His miracles of healing, so we may assume that the action of God in the Transfiguration was in response to the desire, and was in its form determined by the content of the desire, of Jesus. Jesus desired the assurance that He was indeed fulfilling law and prophecy in His death, and that through death He would pass to the Father's presence in glory, as Moses and Elijah. It is even possible that the suggestion presented itself to His mind that He might be taken by God in the mysterious or glorious way in which Moses and Elijah

were believed to have escaped the common lot. The appearance of Moses and Elijah as the representatives of law and prophecy assured Him on the first point. Their appearance to Him *in glory*, a glory which by anticipation He was divinely made for a time to share, would assure Him on the second. As regards the third point, by their converse about His "decease which He was to accomplish in Jerusalem," He was assured that it was not the Father's will that His departure should be secret and mysterious as that of Moses, or glorious as that of Elijah, but public and humiliating, as was needful for the fulfilment of His vocation as the vicarious sacrifice of a sinful and guilty mankind. Thus assured Himself, He desired that His chosen companions should share the vision, so that their desires, rebellious and resistant, might be brought into accord with, and submission to, His purpose. The energy of His will was the condition necessary for their participation in the vision granted to His prayer.

(8) They saw what He saw, because in His love for them He willed that they should see ; but it was only for a moment that the spell of His personality transported them into His own attitude of receptivity for the invisible and eternal. Peter's foolish proposal showed how unprepared they were to receive the assurance regarding His death and resurrection which the vision was intended to convey to them. And, therefore, the vision passed in a bright cloud overshadowing them, hiding from them their Master and His heavenly visitants. But when the heavenly vision had failed, then the heavenly voice might succeed. If they could not interpret the vision, and learn from it that through death their Master must pass to His glory, they might at least be impressed with the conviction of His intimate communion in filial affection with God, and be induced to recognize the absolute authority of His teaching on this

theme, in spite of their opposing ambitions, and resisting inclinations. As regards the words uttered by the heavenly voice the Evangelists are not in agreement. *Matthew* adds, "in whom I am well pleased," but as this is found also in the account of the Baptism, it is probable that it is transferred from the one incident to the other. *Matthew* and *Mark* agree in the phrase, "*This is my beloved Son.*" *Luke* has the variant, "*This is my Son, my chosen,*" which, as more in accord with Old Testament usage, may be the original form ; but it is not necessary to decide between the alternatives. All the Evangelists have the command, "Hear ye Him." If we compare the content of the Voice at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, we shall be led to the conclusion that the former was addressed primarily to Christ, and the latter to the disciples. For *Matthew's* report in the third person, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (iii. 17), seems less probable than *Mark's* and *Luke's* in the second person, "Thou art my beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased" (i. 11, iii. 22). At the Baptism, when Jesus had dedicated Himself to His vocation, He Himself needed the assurance of the Divine approval. At the Transfiguration the Vision itself had given Him the assurance He desired, and the Voice was added to confirm His authority with His disciples. From the fear that fell on the disciples when they heard the Voice, they were restored by the touch, the voice, and the appearance of Jesus alone in His familiar guise. His prohibition, "Tell the vision to no man until the Son of Man be raised from the dead" (Matt. xvii. 9) was in conformity with His constant refusal to try and compel faith in Himself by any outward signs. His disciples' trust in and surrender to Himself might be confirmed by heavenly Vision or Voice, for their attitude was right, but the indifferent and hostile could not be thus won.

(9) To this exposition of the Synoptic narratives of the

Transfiguration it seems desirable to add a brief consideration of these passages in other New Testament writings which seem to have some relation to this event. In the Fourth Gospel (xii. 20-33), after the request of the Greeks to see Jesus has been communicated to Him, He is reported to have uttered words regarding the necessity of His death which bear some resemblance to Synoptic utterances. While the saying in *v.* 24 regarding the grain of wheat has no Synoptic parallel, but a Pauline (1 Cor. xv. 36), the utterance in *v.* 25 regarding the loss of life by loving it, and its gain by hating it, has a close resemblance, not only to the saying in Matthew x. 39 regarding the loss and finding of life (which is there probably out of its proper context), but to the similar saying in Matthew xvi. 25, where the group of sayings is strikingly appropriate to the occasion, the remonstrance of Peter and his rebuke as a tempter by Jesus. There is a likeness, if not so close, between Matthew xvi. 24 and John xii. 26. It is true that it is not improbable that Jesus repeated sayings on different occasions, when appropriate; and the appropriateness of these sayings in the context in the Fourth Gospel cannot be denied. But what does at least call for attention is that the resemblance in this passage to Synoptic passages continues. Jesus' confession and prayer ("Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name" (*v.* 27) shows at least so much resemblance to the prayers in Gethsemane, as recorded by Matthew ("My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death . . . O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt. . . . O my Father, if this cannot pass away except I drink it, thy will be done," xxvi. 38, 39, 42), that this passage might be regarded as a reminiscence of that scene. Following still this passage, we find it recorded that, in re-

sponse to Jesus' prayer, "There came a voice out of heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again" (v. 28). Although the phraseology is distinctly Johannine, yet the import of the Voice cannot but remind us of the Vision and the Voice at the Transfiguration. There seem to be combined in this passage reminiscences of three crises in the "Inner Life" of Jesus, the Confession at Caesarea Philippi, the Transfiguration on the Mount, and the Agony in Gethsemane. There is this difference. In the Synoptists each of these crises is passed through in private, in the company of the twelve alone, or only of three chosen companions. The Fourth Evangelist not only represents the impersonal utterances as public, but even the intimate personal experiences of Jesus. The multitude hear the confession and the prayer, and the heavenly voice that is God's response. Jesus expressly affirms His desire for publicity. "This voice has not come for my sake, but for your sakes" (v. 30). How is this to be reconciled with His reserve according to the Synoptists? Is it more probable that Jesus would bare His heart before the multitude than that He would keep His most sacred experiences for the privacy of the company of His disciples, or even of the three chosen out of the twelve for this closer intimacy? Is it more probable that He forbade even the mention of the Vision or the Voice at the Transfiguration, or that His public ministry was attested by such outward signs? In candour one is compelled to confess that, however convincing much of the evidence for the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel is, this absence of reserve regarding the most intimate and sacred experiences of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel in contrast with the Synoptists is one of the greatest difficulties to be faced. Whatever be the solution of this problem (the writer himself does not profess to have reached one), it is interesting to note that the Fourth Gospel confirms the

testimony of the Synoptics that His death was to Jesus a mystery and a terror, and that He sought and found divine assurance regarding His victory in death.

(10) The allusion to the Transfiguration in 2 Peter i. 17, 18, "For He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; and this voice we ourselves heard come out of heaven, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount," cannot be altogether passed over. It is evident that the writer intends to represent himself as an eye- and ear-witness, and yet the arguments against the Petrine authorship are so strong that many scholars feel compelled to regard the writer as trying by such means to invest his writing with an apostolic authority it did not possess. It is this doubt that forbids our use of this passage to determine the words uttered by the heavenly Voice; it will be observed that the words given here correspond to those found in Matthew's Gospel, but not to the report given in Mark's Gospel, which by ancient tradition is connected more directly with Peter's preaching.

(11) While the allusion in 2 Peter throws no light on the incident, very suggestive is the comment in Hebrews ii. 9, "But we behold Him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God He should taste death for every man." Scholars have found great difficulty with the syntax of this sentence, as the crowning with glory and honour, assumed generally to be at the Resurrection and Ascension, is here made antecedent to, and preparatory for, the sacrificial death. But does not the difficulty disappear if we regard this as an allusion to the Transfiguration? This Epistle is distinguished for the insight the writer displays into the earthly

life of Jesus ; for the writer emphasizes the humanity as the necessary condition for the discharge of the priestly calling. The Temptation is understood in its essential significance, "For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted" (ii. 18). "For we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities ; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (iv. 15). The very core of Jesus' experience in Gethsemane seems to be set out in the words, "Who in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and having been heard for His godly fear, though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered" (v. 7-8). So in this passage the meaning of the Transfiguration is exhibited. It had been fitting that the manhood of Jesus as blessed and approved of God should pass into immortality, glory, blessedness without the painful and humbling experience of the common lot of death ; but Jesus anticipated this state of perfection in the Transfiguration for a brief period, in order that He might of His own choice, but in obedience to the demands of the grace of His Father, accept the common lot on behalf and for the good of mankind, that having beheld the honour and glory belonging to, and in store for, Him, He might all the more keenly realize the darkness and the dread that death may bring ; that His death might be not a personal experience only, but a vicarious sacrifice of universal value.

(12) The writer has advanced this psychological interpretation of the *Transfiguration* as most in accord with the historical method of studying the Scriptures now current ; but in closing he may indulge his own inclinations to theological construction by indicating a more speculative exposition, for which, however, he is not prepared to claim the

same probability. Assuming that man was created as liable to death, but also as capable, by a personal development mentally, morally, spiritually in accordance with the Divine purpose, of transcending that limitation, and that it was man's failure to realize his divinely appointed destiny which made the liability an actuality, we may conceive Christ as having at the Transfiguration so completed the sinless development of manhood as to have attained for Himself the glory and blessedness of immortality, but as having not counted it as a prize to be snatched, but having emptied Himself of this prerogative fully and freely, so that He might in love to God and man humble Himself to become obedient to death, even the death of the Cross, not as a necessity of nature, but as a choice of saving grace.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE HOLINESS OF GOD, AND OF THE GODLY.

*Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος.

LEVITICUS XI. 44, 45, XIX. 2, XX. 26, XXI. 8; 1 PETER I. 16.

It is very remarkable that, although the word *holy* is common in religious literature, there is no agreement as to its exact meaning; and that, although the Hebrew word thus rendered and its cognates are found in the Old Testament some 800 times and its Greek equivalent not unfrequently in the New Testament, there is, in spite of a general agreement among scholars and theologians about its meaning when predicated of things and men, no agreement whatever about its meaning when predicated of God. Yet the conspicuous passages placed at the head of this paper suggest irresistibly that there must have been, in the minds of the sacred writers, some one definite conception of holiness conveyed by the word whether predicated of men or of God.

The unsatisfactory position in theology of this important topic, I shall illustrate by reference to the admirable volume on *The Theology of the Old Testament* by the late Professor Davidson, published two years ago; a work about which our chief regret is that it was not in our hands twenty years earlier.

The subject of holiness is brought before the readers twice. On pp. 144–160, the writer discusses *The Holiness of God*: and on pp. 252–259, under *The Terms descriptive of the Covenant Relation*, he discusses the holiness of “men and things,” and again the holiness of God, repeating almost word for word much that is said on the earlier pages. He says correctly, on p. 253, that with regard to things the word *holy* cannot denote a moral attribute, but only a relation, viz. “*belonging to Jehovah, dedicated to Godhead.*” So on p. 254: “the term *holy*, whether applied to things or

men in Israel, or to all Israel, signifies that they are the possession of Jehovah." He also appropriately contrasts the *holy* with the *profane* : and justly adds, "it is quite possible that this formal idea of relation to Jehovah might gather into it, if I may say so, a certain amount of contents. Only clean things could be dedicated to Jehovah. Only men of a character like His own could be His property. And it is possible, therefore, that the word *holy* may occasionally be used to cover this secondary idea. But this is not its primary use, and in any case is rare."

Dr. Davidson admits that "the Holiness of Jehovah is a very obscure subject, and the most diverse views regarding it have prevailed among Old Testament students" : p. 144. So on p. 145 : "in the oldest use of the word, even when applied to men, it expresses rather a *relation*, simply *belonging to Jehovah* or *the gods* ; and when applied to Jehovah it rather expresses His transcendental attributes or that which we call Godhead, as opposed to the human." He correctly calls attention, on p. 149, to the close relation between the holiness and the *jealousy* of God. On p. 150, he says that in Phœnician "the gods are called 'the *holy gods*,'" as in Daniel iv. 8, 9, v. 11 ; adding, on p. 151, "it seems clear that *Kadosh* is not a word that expresses any attribute of deity, but Deity itself ; though it remains obscure what the primary idea of the word was which long before the period of literature made it fit in the estimation of the Shemitic people to be so used." He suitably warns us, on p. 257, that "etymology is rarely a safe guide to the real meaning of words. . . . Usage is the only safe guide. . . . Hence the Concordance is always a safer companion than the Lexicon." This last is an important lesson.

In Professor Davidson's main discussion of the holiness of God, on pp. 144-160, he says nothing about the conspicuous and all-important passages from the Old and New Testa-

ments placed at the beginning of this paper. But on p. 255 he says, "A more difficult question presents itself when we inquire what is meant when it is said, 'Jehovah is holy.' First, it is out of the question to say that as Israel is holy, being dedicated to Jehovah, so Jehovah is *holy*, as belonging to Israel; and that the language *be ye holy : for I am holy*, means nothing more than 'be mine : for I am yours.' That sentence means, at all events, *be My people : for I am your God*. Holy, on the side of Israel, meant devoted to God—not devoted in general. The conception of God was an essential part of the idea. But this suggests at once that *holy*, as applied to Jehovah, is an expression in some way describing Deity; i.e. not describing Deity on any particular side of His nature, for which it is a fixed term, but applicable to Him on any side, the manifestation of which impresses men with the sense of His Divinity." All this contains much truth, as does all that Professor Davidson writes. But it leaves the holiness of God, so conspicuous in the books of Leviticus and Isaiah, outside the circle of the familiar holy objects of the Mosaic ritual; and almost meaningless. Indeed, on p. 145 he says that the word *holy* "is so much peculiar to the gods, e.g. in Phœnician, that the gods are spoken of as the 'holy gods'; the term *holy* being a mere *epitheton ornans*, having no force."

Surely this cannot be. We must seek for some central idea conveyed by the word *holy* whether predicated of God or men or things; and, in Leviticus xi. 44, etc., and 1 Peter i. 16, we must seek for some definite element in the nature of God affording a strong motive for the holiness of His servants.

In the languages cognate to Hebrew, the root of the word rendered *holy* is found in the sense of men or things devoted to Deity: and the same word is applied, as in the

Old Testament, to God or the gods. The same idea referring to persons and things is embodied in the Greek word *ἅγιος*. In all the chief component documents of the Hexateuch, the word *holy* is found applied both to God and to various men and things and places and times. But it is specially conspicuous in the Priestly Code and in Ezekiel, and in a less degree in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, documents giving prominence to the ritual of the Tabernacle and Temple. Throughout the Book of Isaiah the phrase *Holy One of Israel* is very frequent, and is occasionally found elsewhere. But the word *holy* is seldom used in Judges-Kings, or in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets. All this seems to show that the idea of holiness as devotion to Deity was in very early times prevalent in the Semitic races, that it received special development in the religious impulse which followed Israel's deliverance from Egypt, and that this peculiar development culminated during or after the Exile, when national independence was lost and nothing remained except Israel's memories of the past, and her ritual, sacred books, and knowledge of God.

The chief interest now of the Old Testament conception of holiness is its relation to the Gospel of Christ as set forth in the New Testament. In this last we find the real and abiding value of the ancient ritual. This being so, the dates of the various documents composing the Pentateuch have little bearing on the subject before us. The Old Testament as we have it in Hebrew and Greek embodies Israel's conception, at the time of Christ, of its past history and of its peculiar relation to God: and, in a form practically the same as we now possess, it was constantly moulding the religious thought of the nation. A careful study of the Old Testament is therefore a necessary condition for intelligent comprehension of the doctrine of holiness as it was understood by the earliest followers of Christ.

It is impossible to determine whether the word *holy* was applied earlier to God or to men and things. But our inquiry must begin with the latter application. For, as applied to men and things, the meaning of the word is quite clear and indisputable, whereas about its application to God there is, as Professor Davidson admits, neither agreement nor confidence. Our research must proceed from that about which we know most to that of which we know less. The number and variety of the holy objects ever before the eyes of Israel, or made familiar by the reading of the Sacred Books, would give great definiteness to the one idea common to all. Every one knew that the firstborn, the Tabernacle and Temple and all that belonged to them, and everything holy, were set apart for God; and that the priests were separated from all other work to do His bidding.

A distinguishing feature of the holiness of the Old Testament, as compared with all Gentile conceptions of holiness, is that the holy objects were, not merely devoted to God by the piety of men, but expressly and solemnly claimed by Him; and therefore could be withheld from Him only by direct disobedience. This is very conspicuous in Numbers viii. 14-17; where notice five times the use of the word הֵן which we are compelled to render *mine* or *to Me* or *for Me*, thus breaking the force of the repetition. "And thou shalt separate the Levites from among the sons of Israel: and the Levites shall be *Mine*," or "*for Me*. . . . For altogether given *to Me* are they from among the sons of Israel. . . . I have taken them *for Myself*. For *Mine* are all the firstborn among the sons of Israel both man and cattle. In the day when I smote every firstborn in the land of Egypt, I sanctified them *for Myself*." Compare Exodus xiii. 2, 12, Numbers iii. 12, 13; Deuteronomy xv. 19. This preposition הֵן is a constant companion of the words *holy* and *sanctify*.

The above passages are samples of many others throughout the Old Testament. Wherever the word *holy* is used of men or things, the meaning is the same, and is clearly marked. These holy objects stand, by God's command, in special relation to Himself as His property. Consequently they are not man's. They have no human owner who can do with them as he pleases. None can touch them except at the bidding of God. Else (Malachi iii. 8) he will be guilty of robbing God. The word *holy* is the inviolable Broad-Arrow of the divine King of Israel.

This express claim of God to certain objects which thus become holy is conspicuous wherever the words *holy* and *sanctify* are found in the Old Testament. Consequently the consecration of the holy objects is attributed both to God and to man: e.g. in Exodus xx. 8, Israel is bidden to "remember the Sabbath Day, to sanctify it"; whereas in v. 11, as in Genesis ii. 3, we read that "God blessed the Sabbath, and sanctified it." This consecration could not be set aside by man's disobedience, but remained to condemn those who refused to yield what God had claimed. This may be suitably called OBJECTIVE holiness. Thus God sanctified for Himself men, things, places, and times. But, since the holy objects were under the control of men, these last also were said to sanctify them. They did this by formally placing themselves and their goods at the disposal of God, or by separating themselves from everything inconsistent with His service. This may be called SUBJECTIVE holiness. It is man's surrender to God of that which He has claimed. This distinction is of utmost importance. The former traces holiness to its source in God; the latter points to the obligation laid on man by this claim of God.

In Numbers xvi. 3-11, the word *holy* describes the priesthood, even as distinguished from the Levites; and in chapter

viii. 16 f. a modified holiness is given to the Levites. See also 2 Chronicles xxiii. 6. But in Exodus xix. 6, in a document apparently earlier than the Priestly Code, the whole nation is called a kingdom of priests. This embodies a loftier conception of holiness, as belonging, not to a separated caste, but to the whole race. This loftier and perhaps earlier teaching prepares a way for that of the New Testament, in which all church members, even those blamed as being still "babes in Christ," are called "saints" and said to be "*sanctified* in Christ": 1 Corinthians i. 2, iii. 1. So frequently in the letters of Paul, that to the Hebrews, and the Book of Revelation; also in Acts ix. 13, 32, 41, xxvi. 10, Jude 3. To those familiar with the old Testament ritual, this designation was full of significance: for it implied that He who claimed from Aaron and his sons a life-long devotion had claimed the same from all members of His Church. The word *saint* was therefore a very appropriate designation of the followers of Christ: for it declares what God requires them to be. To admit sin or selfishness into their hearts, is sacrilege. It also indicates their privilege. By calling His people *saints*, God declares His will that we live a life of which He is the one and only aim. Therefore, since our own efforts have proved that such a life is utterly beyond our power, we may take back to God the name He gives us, and claim in faith that it be realized by His power in our heart and life. To keep these all-important truths ever before the mind of believers, the Holy Spirit moved the early Christians to speak of themselves as *saints* or *holy* men. This is the OBJECTIVE holiness of the Church of Christ.

But although, as claimed by God, all His children are holy, the full idea of holiness is realized in them only so far as they yield to him the devotion He claims. To bear the name of *saint* and yet be animated in part by a selfish

spirit, is evidently a contradiction in terms. Consequently, in a few passages, the word *holy* denotes actual and absolute devotion to God. And holiness is set before the people of God as a standard for their attainment. So 1 Corinthians vii. 34, "that she may be holy both in body and spirit," parallel with "how she may please the Lord": Ephesians i. 4, "that we may be holy and blameless": 1 Thessalonians, v. 23, "may the God of peace sanctify you": Hebrews xii. 14, "follow after sanctification": 1 Peter i. 15, "be yourselves holy in all behaviour." In these passages the word *holy* denotes a realization in man of God's purpose that he live a life of which God is the one and only aim. In this sense, to be holy is to look upon oneself and all his possessions as belonging to God and to use all his time, powers, and opportunities, to work out the purposes of God, i.e. to advance the kingdom of Christ. This is the SUBJECTIVE holiness to which God calls His people.

A fine example of New Testament sacerdotalism is found in Romans xv. 16: "that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles, preaching as a sacred work (*ἱερουργοῦντα*) the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles may be acceptable, sanctified in the Holy Spirit." Similarly 1 Peter ii. 5, 9: "a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. . . . a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession," quoted from Exodus xix. 5. Whatever sacredness belonged to the ancient priesthood and sacrifices, belongs in far higher degree to the entire life of every servant of Christ.

This subjective holiness, in which all our powers, possessions, and opportunities are laid upon the altar of God, and our every thought, purpose, and effort are stimulated and controlled by one purpose, viz. to work out the pur-

poses of God, is the ideal Christian life, the ultimate standard of Christian excellence. This ideal, dimly outlined in the symbolic teaching of the Old Testament ritual, found perfect realization in the earthly life of Him who said, "I am come down from heaven, not in order that I may do My will, but the will of Him that sent Me." And, that it might be realized in His servants, He gave up His life: "He died in order that they who live may live, no longer for themselves, but for Him who on their behalf died and was raised": 2 Corinthians v. 15. It is realized in them in proportion to the faith with which they venture to expect it, by the Holy Spirit in whom Christ lives in them: Galatians ii. 20.

With this view of the symbolic holiness of the ancient ritual and of the holiness of the servants of Christ, we come now to consider the significance of the HOLINESS OF GOD in the Old Testament and in a few passages of the New.

This attribute of God receives solemn expression in the vision preceding the call and consecration of Isaiah: "Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of Hosts," chapter vi. 3. And these words are re-echoed in the frequent title "*Holy One of Israel*," e.g. chapters i. 4, v. 24, xii. 6, etc., also xli. 14, 16, 20, xliii. 3, 14, etc. These passages and many more throughout the Book of Isaiah, with a few others in other prophets, bear witness to the prevalence in Israel, in the times of the prophets, of the conception of the holiness of God. But there is little in the books of the prophets to guide us to the precise meaning conveyed by the word *holy* as thus used. The meaning cannot be derived from the word itself, but must be reflected back upon it from its use in other passages or from the context. Hence the variety of interpretations.

Very conspicuous in the Priestly Code of the Pentateuch, a document dealing specially with the ritual of the Taber-

nacle, and possibly of date later than the time of Isaiah, is the phrase, several times repeated, "Ye shall be *holy* : because *holy* am I," in Leviticus xi. 44 repeated word for word in v. 45, also chapter xix. 2 ; xx. 7, 26. This last verse is very significant : "Ye shall be *for Me holy* men ; because *holy* am I, Jehovah, and I have separated you from the peoples to be *Mine*" or "*for Me.*" Cp. Numbers viii. 16, 17, quoted above. Also Leviticus xxi. 8 : "And thou shalt *sanctify* him : because it is he that offereth the bread of thy God. *Holy* shall he be *to thee* : because *holy* am I Jehovah that *sanctifieth* you." Here a command that Israel be holy is supported several times by an assertion that God is holy. It is impossible to give to the holiness here so solemnly laid as a duty upon Israel any meaning other than that made familiar by the various sacred men and things and places and times which occupy so large a place in the Book of Leviticus : and impossible also to give to the same word, in the same phrase so frequently repeated, any radically different meaning when predicated of God. Otherwise the motive so frequently adduced would be without force. The same motive for the holiness of the servants of God, but on an infinitely higher plane, is adduced in very different circumstances in 1 Peter i. 15, 16. All these passages imply that the holiness of God is an element of His nature analogous to the holiness which He requires in His servants, differing from this last only as God differs from man ; that behind and beneath and above the complicated series of the holy objects of the Old Covenant and the whole life of the ransomed servants of Christ is the Holy God.

In his very scanty treatment of the above Old Testament passages, on p. 255 f., Professor Davidson suggests that "*holy* as applied to Jehovah is an expression in some way describing Deity ; i.e. not describing any particular side

of His nature, for which it is a fixed term, but applicable to Him on any side, the manifestation of which impresses men with the sense of His divinity." But this fails utterly to explain the motive here adduced. Moreover, the holiness demanded of Israel can be understood only in the light of the holiness set in the New Testament before the servants of Christ.

That the term *holy*, so familiar to Israel in the many and various holy objects, is solemnly and repeatedly predicated of God, implies that behind and above these visible holy objects is an invisible and supreme Holy Person, that these holy men and things are a revelation of a definite element of His nature. We therefore ask, What new view of God did Israel gain by contemplating these various holy objects, irrational and rational? In them we must seek for a manifestation of an attribute of God bearing to these created holy objects a relation similar to that of the Creator to the creature. We have seen that these objects were made holy by God's claim to the exclusive use of them. Now whatever God does, especially whatever He does frequently and conspicuously, is an outflow and revelation of His nature. Moses, Aaron and Israel, as they encamped around the Sacred Tent, had thoughts of God very different from their thoughts in former days. God was now the great Being who had claimed from Aaron a lifelong and exclusive service. This claim must have created a new era in his conception of God. By predicating of Himself the word *holy*, familiarly applied to various visible objects claimed for His use, God taught that this claim was an outflow and expression of His own nature, of a definite element in God. He was now the God of the altar, the tabernacle, the priesthood, the sacrifices, the sabbath, the holy nation. The Holiness of God is that in Him of which these are visible exponents. By calling Himself *holy*, God proclaimed that

in virtue of His own nature, and of the essential relation of the Creator to His creatures, He can do no other than claim their unreserved devotion, and that in this devotion He can tolerate no rival. Consequently, to refuse to surrender that which God has thus claimed, is to set oneself against the essential nature of God.

As thus understood, the holiness of God stands closely related to His *jealousy*. So expressly in Joshua xxiv. 19 f. : "Ye cannot serve Jehovah : for a holy God is He, a jealous God is He ; He will not pardon your transgression and your sins. If ye forsake Jehovah and serve strange gods, He will turn and do you evil and consume you after that He did you good." Thus the holiness of God vindicates its claim by punishment. Similarly, Exodus xx. 5, xxxiv. 14, Deuteronomy iv. 24, v. 9, vi. 15.

All this sheds light on the passages at the head of this paper. In those from Leviticus, God bids Israel abstain from eating certain animals marked off as unclean, to honour parents, to keep the Sabbath, and to turn from idolatry. These claims to set limitations to the life of men and to give commands, God supports by saying that His own relation to Israel gives Him a right to universal ownership and control. In these verses the holiness of God who claims submission stands related to the objects claimed, rational and irrational, as the Creator is related to His creatures. The holiness of God is correlative to that of His creatures : the one demands the other. Overshadowing the holy things of the Old Covenant, stands the "Holy One of Israel."

Similarly, in 1 Peter i. 15, 16 the writer urges his readers to act in every turning and movement of life as men whom God has solemnly set apart for His own service, their action thus corresponding to the nature of Him Who has "called" them to render to Him a service of unreserved devotion. This exhortation he supports by quoting a conspicuous

group of passages which recall the solemnity of the ancient ritual and priesthood, thus claiming a similar dignity for the every-day life of all servants of Christ.

The above is the OBJECTIVE holiness of God. When God manifested by word or act the strictness of His claim, He was said *to be sanctified*: so Leviticus x. 3, "in those that come near to Me I will be *sanctified*." When men yielded to God the devotion He claimed, i.e. when in the SUBJECTIVE world of their own inner and outer life they put God in the place of honour as their Master and Owner, they were said *to sanctify God*. So Deuteronomy xxxii. 51, Numbers xxvii. 14: "because ye did not sanctify Me in the midst of Israel." Similarly 1 Peter iii. 15: "sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts."

The holiness of God is an immediate outflow of His unique and central (1 John iv. 8, 16) attribute of LOVE. For, only by unreserved devotion to the one Source of all good can intelligent creatures obtain their highest well-being. Consequently, the love of God, which ever seeks their highest good, moves Him to claim their devotion. Just as in the Eternal Son the Eternal Stream ever flows back in full volume to its Eternal Source, so must the created powers given to man flow back to their divine Source, in order that thus man may rise towards God. The All-loving must therefore be the All-holy.

Further, since all sin runs directly counter to God, and separates man from God, and thus hinders the blessing which ever flows forth from God, He who claims our devotion is necessarily hostile to all sin. Consequently, holiness is utterly hostile to sin. It is therefore more than purity: for it adds the positive idea of intelligent devotion to the intelligent Source of our being.

All this helps us to understand the meaning and purpose of the Old Testament ritual. In order to teach men, in the only way they could then understand, that God claims that

they look upon themselves as belonging to Him, and use all their powers and time to work out His purposes, He set apart for Himself, in outward and visible and symbolic form, a certain place and certain men, things, and periods of time. Afterwards, when in this way men had become familiar with the idea of holiness, God proclaimed in Christ that this idea must be realized in every man and place and thing and time. Thus in the Biblical conception of holiness, we have an explanation of a marked and otherwise inexplicable feature of the Old Covenant; we have a link binding the Covenants together; and a light which each Covenant reflects back on the other.

While thus claiming, in the earlier symbolic form and afterwards in Christ, the unreserved devotion of men, the Spirit of God moved men to look up to God as Himself holy; and thus to recognize that the consecration He claimed stood in intimate relation to a definite element of His own nature. But this divine attribute of holiness is much less conspicuous in the New Testament than in the Old. In the fuller revelation given in Christ, the holiness of God is somewhat overshadowed by the all-embracing and unique attribute of Love.

If the above exposition be correct, to say that God is holy, is to assert that His claim to the consecration to Himself of the holy men and things and times of the Old Covenant, and His claim to the unreserved devotion of all whom He saves in Christ are an outflow of His inmost nature, even of that Love which is the essence of God. As thus understood, the word *holy* conveys the same root idea in Old or New Testament, whether predicated of God or men or things, differing only as the Creator differs from His creatures, and the rational from the irrational. As Creator, all things, rational and irrational, are *from* Him: as Holy, all things are *for* Him. For he is the Beginning and the End.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

*THE LIFE OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.*¹

XLVIII. THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE, XIV. 65, XV. 1-15.

THE reader who has felt the fascination of the personality of Jesus and the mingled affection and awe which it inspires, will shrink from dwelling on the scenes that follow. He may even be surprised at the calm, concise directness with which St. Mark narrates the indignities and tortures inflicted upon Jesus ; he does not find it necessary to express sympathy with Him, or condemnation of His enemies. He is not afraid of compromising His dignity by depicting Him helpless, disgraced, and humiliated. Doubtless the Oriental was not as sensitive as we are on such points ; but, even so, the manner in which the story is told implies that the authority of Jesus was irrevocably established in the mind of the Evangelist ; it could stand the strain of painful and degrading associations. But to return to the narrative.

After the sentence of the Sanhedrim, Jesus was a condemned criminal in the eyes of the Jews ; and the officers who had Him in charge indulged in brutal horseplay at His expense. They spat upon Him ; covered His face and struck Him, bidding Him “prophesy” who had struck Him ; and beat Him with rods.²

But the Jewish notables were not competent to carry out the public execution of Jesus ; the power of life and death rested with the Roman governor. At day-break, therefore, a deputation of high priests and elders, formally

¹ These studies do not profess to be an adequate historical or dogmatic account of Christ ; they simply attempt to state the impression which the Second Gospel would make upon a reader who had no other sources of information as to Jesus, and was unacquainted with Christian doctrine.

² The meaning, however, of the clause rendered in R.V. “received Him with blows of their hands,” is uncertain.

invested with the authority of the entire Sanhedrim, took Jesus, bound, before Pilate.¹

Jesus' confession of Messiahship was not only blasphemy in the eyes of the Jews, but also treason against Caesar. The Messiah in ancient days and in the popular language of the times was the King of Israel; when Israel had a king, the dominion of Rome in Palestine must cease. Thus the accusers of Jesus could state that with their own ears they had heard Jesus commit treason against the Emperor by putting Himself forward as King of the Jews.

But He stood there, in His simple peasant dress, worn out with the strain of the last few days, with His long vigil, and with the agony of Gethsemane; bearing in His clothing and person marks of the ill-treatment to which He had been subjected; solitary; bound and helpless—He did not look like a dangerous rebel or a would-be king. Pilate was quite capable of estimating the anxiety of the Jews for the interests of Caesar, at its true value. The fact that He was obnoxious to the Jews, and that the Sanhedrim had formally and officially denounced Him, showed that His real crime was not anti-Roman fanaticism. At the season of the Passover the governor's mind was burdened with the task of keeping order in the overcrowded, turbulent city; and the arrest of a popular religious teacher might not seem likely to help him in keeping the peace. Nor would he be best pleased at being made the catspaw of Jewish heresy-hunters. Therefore, when he turned from the accusers to the prisoner, it was with a not altogether unfriendly irony that he asked:

“Art thou the King of the Jews?”

The question was equivalent to that of the High Priest “Art thou the Christ?” and again placed Jesus in a

¹ The text and rendering of Mark xv. 1 are uncertain, but the general sense seems to be as given above.

dilemma. If He said "No," He denied Himself and His mission ; if He said "Yes," He seemed to plead guilty. But the difficulty was less now than before ; His claims did not really involve treason against the Romans. He answered Pilate : "Thou sayest."¹

The words were an acknowledgment of His Kingship ; but they are less emphatic than the "I am" with which He replied to the High Priest. The words themselves, their brevity, and the way in which they were spoken, showed that they were not a challenge to the authority of Caesar. Pilate might not distress himself about Jewish doctrine or ritual ; but if Jesus had spent His week at Jerusalem in preaching rebellion against the Romans, the governor would have heard of it long since. It is not improbable that representations had been made to Pilate on behalf of Jesus ; that he was acquainted with the real state of the case, and knew that Jesus was not a political agitator.

The prosecutors were disagreeably surprised to find that Jesus' avowal of His claims did not elicit from Pilate as prompt a condemnation as His confession of Messiahship had done from the Sanhedrim. Pilate hesitated, and asked for further evidence. The priests replied with a string of accusations, but Jesus remained silent. The governor turned to Him again, and asked if He had no answer to make to the serious charges brought against Him.

But there came no response from the prisoner ; again He seemed lost to His surroundings, caught away to some other world, or perhaps in a measure indifferent through sheer exhaustion. Pilate was astonished at His silence.

¹ It is sometimes maintained that these words do not acknowledge that Pilate's suggestion is correct, but that they are merely a courteous recognition of the fact that Pilate has spoken and been understood. But this view is improbable.

At this point, however, the proceedings were interrupted by the arrival of a noisy crowd, clamouring for the annual concession to popular feeling, which was wont to be made in honour of the Passover. Let the governor release a Jewish prisoner, according to custom. Pilate did not at once realize that the appearance of the crowd while the trial was going on was a mere coincidence. He supposed that they had come just then of set purpose to ask that Jesus should be set free. He knew that Jesus was in high favour with the common people, and that the action of the priests was due to the jealousy aroused by His popularity. The interruption seemed to present a happy opportunity of escaping from a difficult situation by making a graceful concession to the Jews. Pointing to Jesus, he asked them :

“ You wish me to release for you the King of the Jews ? ”

Left to themselves, they might have agreed ; for Pilate's words contained an attractive suggestion. If Jesus had really put Himself forward as a national sovereign, a leader of revolt against the Romans, it would be pious and patriotic to obtain His release. It says much for Pilate's conviction as to the harmlessness of Jesus, that he was willing to place the people in possession of a “ king.”

The priests, however, promptly undeceived the crowd ; the word was passed round that Jesus was by no means a zealous patriot ; He was a Sabbath-breaker, an enemy of the *Torah* and the national traditions, a traitor to the national cause, and everything else that was obnoxious to a good Jew. He had been solemnly condemned by the Sanhedrim, alike by priests, elders and scribes, by Sadducees and Pharisees. Besides, there was a worthy object of their intercession—a man who had ventured to strike a blow for freedom, and shed Gentile blood ; a real patriot ; the brave Bar-Abbas. Unless they used their privilege for his benefit, he would die for his devotion to God and Israel.

So when Pilate offered them Jesus, they shouted for Bar-Abbas.

And Pilate asked them again :

“What do you want me to do with the King of the Jews ? ”

They replied with shouts of—

“Crucify Him ! ”

Pilate knew that the crowd could not at one and the same time be eager for the release of a rebel, and also indignant with Jesus because He was, as the priests said, an enemy of Rome. Possibly he might get from them the real reason for the persecution of Jesus by the Jewish leaders.

“Why,” said he, “what crime has He committed ? ”

The common people could not, and the priests would not, answer such a question ; they were content with shouting more vehemently than ever :

“Crucify Him ! ”

The leading spirits in this particular crowd represented a different stratum of the populace from that which acclaimed Jesus at His entry into Jerusalem and hung upon His lips in the Temple courts. His supporters were largely Galileans, but these turbulent shouters would belong to Jerusalem ; and the men who were anxious to have a jail-bird let loose again upon society were not likely to have been specially impressed with the character and teaching of Jesus. Pilate recognized the presence of an element reckless, truculent, and disorderly, which it was worth while to conciliate at a reasonable price. If they had taken the part of Jesus, the governor would have set Him free in spite of the priests and the Sanhedrim. He was equally willing to gratify the mob by releasing Bar-Abbas and putting Jesus to a shameful and cruel death. Bar-Abbas, therefore, was sent for from prison, and handed

over to his friends, who departed with him in triumph, and Pilate sentenced Jesus to be put to death by crucifixion

Meanwhile the Prisoner stood patient and silent, uttering neither plea nor protest, while His life was sacrificed to save His judge from passing discomfort. In Gethsemane He had recognized that His hour was come, and had submitted Himself to the will of God ; He was indifferent to the forms of human law by which the Divine purpose was fulfilled. He had asserted to the last His mission from God ; His accusers had proved nothing against Him ; the only ground of condemnation by the Sanhedrim was His confession of Messiahship ; and Pilate had declared Him innocent of any secular or political crime. His disciples could still believe in Him.

But there was to be one more stage in the proceedings before Pilate ; a criminal condemned to be crucified was scourged before he was fastened to the cross ; and this preliminary torture was now inflicted upon Jesus. Then the governor gave orders for the carrying out of the sentence, and Jesus was led away to be crucified.

XLIX. JESUS MOCKED BY THE ROMAN SOLDIERS, XV. 16-20.

The soldiers took Jesus from the judgment hall to their own quarters ; for them, as for the attendants of the priests, a condemned prisoner was an opportunity for indulging the popular form of humour which finds its pleasure in the pain and humiliation of helpless sufferers. They called together their comrades to share their enjoyment in deriding this haggard Jew, bound, bleeding and dishevelled, who claimed to be a King. They took off His outer garment, and wrapped Him in a purple cloth that might do duty for a royal robe. They wove a wreath

from the branches of some thorny shrub, and placed it on His head as a royal diadem ; and in His hands they placed a reed for a sceptre. Then they offered Him homage in mockery, greeting Him with the salutation, “ Hail, King of the Jews,” and kneeling to Him in feigned reverence. Not content with derision, they snatched from Him His sham sceptre, and beat Him about the head with it, and spat upon Him.

When they were tired of their sport, they stripped Him of the purple, re clothed Him in His own garments, and led Him out to crucify Him, together with two robbers condemned to the same punishment.

L. THE CRUCIFIXION, XV. 21-27.

It was the custom that a criminal condemned to be crucified should carry his cross ¹ to the place of execution, where the preliminary scourging was usually inflicted.² Some attempt, therefore, was made to place this burden upon Jesus ; but He sank under the load, and it was plain that it was too much for Him. The soldiers, loath to do work that could be forced on some one else, laid hold of a man who was passing on his way in from the country to the city, and made him carry the cross. Years afterwards his two sons felt it an honour that their father had rendered this service to Jesus ; and those who first told the story thought it well to speak of the modest distinction enjoyed by their brethren ; and so we read that the man’s name was Simon of Cyrene, and that he was the father of Alexander and Rufus.

When the cross had been laid upon Simon’s shoulders, the grim procession started once more, the soldiers partly leading, partly carrying the half-fainting Jesus to a hill outside the walls called the Skull, where the cross was to

¹ Or a part of it. *Encycl. Bibl.*

² *Encycl. Bibl.*

be erected. It was now about nine o'clock in the morning, so that Jesus had been four or five hours in the hands of His enemies, for much of the time a victim to insult and outrage.

Before He was fastened to the cross He was offered, according to custom, drugged wine, as a narcotic, to deaden pain; but He refused it. While life remained, some Divine Act or Voice might yet vindicate His innocence and again confirm His mission, even if it were spoken only to His own heart. He would not shut Himself out from the full consciousness of any word which God might yet have for Him. Therefore, with His physical sensitiveness undiminished, except in some measure by exhaustion, Jesus was stripped and fastened to the cross, which was raised and fixed upright; and He was left hanging there, His feet a few inches above the ground. At the head of the cross an inscription set forth His crime; it ran, "The King of the Jews." His accusers had not been wholly successful in branding Him as a blasphemer and a traitor to the Law; the casual spectator would imagine that He died a martyr for the Hope of Israel—one of the many cases in which men arrive at the truth by devious paths. His two companions in misfortune were crucified beside Him, one on the right hand, and the other on the left. Then the soldiers who were left on guard sat down to watch; the clothes of the criminals were, it seems, their perquisites, which they divided amongst themselves by lot.¹

W. H. BENNETT.

¹ Verse 28 is omitted by the Revised Version, following Lachmann and Tischendorf (so also Westcott and Hort, and Weymouth), on the authority of \aleph ABCD, etc. It was apparently introduced by the scribes from Luke xxii. 37.

*BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE ELEVENTH
CENTURY.*

FOR many centuries it was only in Mohammedan countries that the Bible had any chance of being fairly criticised. In Christian communities independent examination of both Testaments was tabooed; the same was the case with regard to the Old Testament among the Jews, and though no scruples of conscience would have prevented them from examining the New Testament, such a proceeding would have been dangerous in the extreme where they lived at the mercy or rather the unmercifulness of the followers of the Gospel. It might have been expected that the Moslems would have been burdened with the defence of both Testaments in addition to that of their own Koran, since the latter claims to confirm both the Law and the Gospel. Against this contingency the sagacious founder of Islam provided when he suggested that the statements of Jews and Christians concerning the contents of their Sacred Books were untrustworthy: whence by easy stages there proceeded the doctrine that the real Law and Gospel had been withdrawn from circulation, and only worthless substitutes survived. This theory still serves as an outwork which Christian missionaries to Moslems must somehow penetrate before they can attack the fortress itself; and in a manual for the use of such missionaries published last year¹ the author's efforts are largely devoted to proving that the existing Testaments are those which the Koran professes to confirm.

The belief in the spuriousness of the Jewish and Christian Bibles is not indeed held by all Moslems, some of whom are satisfied that they are genuine enough to be used for histori-

¹ St. Clair Tisdall, *Mohammedan Objections to Christianity*.

cal, archaeological, and even theological inquiries. These persons find the Koran sufficiently confirmed by them ; and indeed one who can find in the Old Testament the text "He shall be called a Nazarene" should have no difficulty in finding in it the description of the Prophet Mohammed. But controversy with Jews or Christians usually forces Moslems to maintain the doctrine of the spuriousness of both Testaments as their surest weapon, since the ignorance of the author of the Koran is otherwise the strongest point made by the antagonist.

The ordinary Moslem is probably satisfied with the Prophet's hints on this subject, which amount to little more than a charge of habitual misquotation brought against the Jews and Christians of his time ; but there are at all times earnest students who prefer to sift the evidence for themselves. Not content with their Prophet's assurance, they endeavour to find internal proof of the spuriousness of both Testaments. Probably they are surprised by the ease with which the desired evidence comes to their hands.

The earliest work by a Mohammedan in which the Testaments are shown by internal evidence to be spurious is said to be the treatise on Sects, Creeds and Fancies by Ibn Hazm of Cordova, who lived from 994-1064. Of this work an account was some years ago given by Goldziher, in a treatise on the Zahirites, to whose Sect, Creed or Fancy Ibn Hazm belonged. His purpose is to refute all philosophies and religions except his own ; and thus he finds occasion to demonstrate the futility of Judaism and Christianity. His biographer tells us that he was notorious for the sharpness of his tongue, and this notoriety was not cheaply acquired. Though he appears not to have studied Greek or Hebrew, he clearly took pains to make himself acquainted with translations of both the Old and the

New Testaments, and indeed of the former in renderings made from both the Hebrew and the LXX. He also is aware of the existence of the Talmud and produces one or two passages from it. Further, he had seen the works of Josephus, had consulted Jewish and Christian scholars on various difficulties, and been present at debates in which the merits of the three religions were discussed. Hence his objections are only rarely based on mistranslations or misapprehensions of the meaning of texts, and as a scholar he compares most favourably with the bulk of his co-religionists.

Comparison of his treatise with modern works of similar import—of which the Rationalist Press Association has issued or re-issued a great number—shows that thought in the eleventh century, when released from *a priori* assumptions, was similar to thought in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Objection can be taken to the Bible on physical, historical, moral and theological grounds. From the first kind of objection the Mohammedan critic naturally abstains, except in rare cases; for the miracles of the Gospels are to a considerable extent attested by the Koran—indeed with additions. But some modern works also avoid this form of attack, following the opinion of J. S. Mill, that the belief in miracles is not illogical where the presence of a cause sufficient to produce them is assumed. But in the remaining three classes of objections the Moslem critic constantly coincides with modern writers, and if he has not noticed every contradiction in the Gospels discussed by Strauss, one reason is that he does not profess to empty his quiver. The canon employed by the author of *The Four Gospels as Historical Records*, that where two stories conflict, one must be false, but both may be, is stated clearly by Ibn Hazm. Hence he collects the discrepancies in the Gospels from the Genealogies to the various accounts

of the Resurrection. Then he attacks the moral character of the Christ of the Gospels, not, like Evan Meredith, with the view of traducing the Founder of Christianity, but rather like J. R. Greg, in order to show that the Evangelists were untrustworthy. A false prophecy being to his mind inconsistent with the character of a Prophet, he condemns the authors of the Gospels for ascribing to Jesus the declarations that He would be entombed for three days and three nights, and that the Second Coming would be within the lifetime of His followers. Since a Prophet cannot say what is untrue, those sayings are condemned as apocryphal which evidently conflict with the facts. Christ cannot have promised His followers that any two of them agreeing together could obtain by prayer whatever they desired. He cannot have promised that if they had a grain of faith of the size of a mustard seed they would remove mountains—unless, indeed, the Christians were prepared to grant that no member of their community had ever possessed faith equal in quantity to the smallest of all seeds. He cannot have both declared that He came not to destroy the Law, and have repealed the Mosaic law of divorce.

His criterion for distinguishing genuine sayings of Christ from spurious does not differ materially from some that have been used by recent writers, and indeed are still employed. Mr. Greg, in a once popular work (*The Creed of Christendom*, 3rd ed. 1874, ii. 7), asks whether any one can maintain it conceivable that Jesus should have conferred the awful power of deciding the salvation or damnation of his fellow-men on one so frail, so faulty, and so fallible as Peter? Much the same criticism is made by Ibn Hazm on the well known passage in the first Gospel. "In the 16th chapter we read that Christ said to Peter, 'Unto thee I make over the keys of heaven, and whatsoever thou forbiddest on earth shall be forbidden in heaven, etc.';

then four lines further down he says to Peter, continuing the same discourse, 'Follow me, thou opponent, and thwart me not, for thou knowest not the pleasure of God, but only the pleasure of men.' Small as this section is [I omit the author's abuse], it contains two atrocities. The first is that he makes over to the wretch Peter the keys of heaven, and gives him divine power; the second that after giving him these keys and making him either autocrat of the universe or associate with God, he tells him that he is an opponent and ready to thwart, ignorant of God's pleasure, and only acquainted with the pleasure of men. Surely to a person of that sort the keys of the very humblest apartment should not be made over. But then we notice that in the 12th chapter of Mark,¹ 'Christ associates the other Apostles with Peter in this power, not excluding Iscariot, who betrayed him for thirty dirhems. What then is to happen in heaven and earth if they differ on any question of forbidding and permitting? You answer that they will never differ. What difference, I ask, can be greater than that between Iscariot and the rest on the permissibility of taking thirty dirhems for their master's life?' Ibn Hazm argues like Mr. Greg—certainly using many stronger expressions—that this story must be an invention, because it disagrees with the character of Christ, which they have otherwise ascertained, the Moslem writer from the Koran, Mr. Greg from his general impressions. When a saying appears to be worthy of the Speaker both critics regard it as genuine, and here too they are sometimes agreed; thus the argument by which Davidic descent is disclaimed for the Messiah appears to both to be historical. For the fabrication of the spurious sayings Ibn Hazm throws the blame on the Evangelists; and those modern critics who adopt this criterion for separating true sayings from false can find no better scapegoat.

¹ Rather, Matt. xviii.

Another class of objections may be termed theological, as they are based on doctrines currently received among Christians. Naturally much is made of those passages which seem to exclude the idea of the divinity of Christ. Thus the prayer "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do" is made the subject of a dilemma. Was this prayer answered? Then what right have the Christians to taunt the Jews with a sin which has been forgiven them, and for which therefore they are no longer responsible? Was it not answered? How then is such failure to be reconciled with the divinity of Him who uttered the prayer? Similarly he argues from two well known passages that the Sabbath must still be binding on Christians, or the Gospels must be untrustworthy.

His extreme literalism has, perhaps, enabled him to detect one or two contradictions which more modern critics do not notice. He finds a discrepancy between the assertion that John came neither eating nor drinking and the account of John's food which the Gospels contain. This is because the Koran expressly declares that all Prophets came eating and drinking, i.e., subject to the ordinary needs of mankind. A more curious objection is to the prophecy of Christ that He would be slain, "when all four Gospels state that He died a natural death." This objection is due to the fact that the method of crucifixion in use in Moslem states often permitted the victim to linger for some days.

His criticism of the Old Testament is largely occupied with arithmetical difficulties, and he declares that the fabricator must have been poorly equipped in mathematics. Some of his points are rather trivial, as that Moses must have lived at least 122 years and not only 120; but others are more serious and familiar to all who are acquainted with modern criticism. He regards the growth of the Israelitish people in the interval between Joseph and Moses

as a sheer impossibility, and communicates some notices he had purposely collected of abnormally large families ; fourteen sons he found was a high average even in polygamous households. To the pedigree of David he makes some objections also grounded on statistics. But many more of his attacks are theological, i.e. directed against verses which ascribe to eminent persons acts or words for which they could not in his opinion possibly be responsible. Thus Sarah could neither have lied on the subject of her laughter, nor have contradicted the assertion of the Deity on the subject. With perhaps more reason he declares that a man guided by God like Joshua could not have uttered the terrible sentence which condemned Achan's innocent family with Achan to the flames. The Psalms are condemned by him for polytheism, since they not only mention God's son (Ps. ii.), but even His daughter and son-in-law (Ps. xlv.) ; and for profanity in comparing Him to a giant moistened with wine—a state which all experience shows to be one not of strength and vigour, but weakness. The major Prophets he charges with gross anthropomorphism. The prophecies concerning the glories of Abraham's descendants he declares to be serious exaggerations if they refer to Israel, equally serious understatements if they refer to the Arabs. From the Talmud he only quotes one or two absurdities.

Of the origin of the Biblical Books he advances certain theories. The Pentateuch he supposes to be in the main the work of the Rabbis ; he can find no evidence of the existence, during the political independence of Israel, of more than one copy of the Law, kept in the Temple at Jerusalem ; since the Jews were alternately idolatrous and monotheistic, and the priests shared in the general apostasies, what more likely than that they tampered again and again with the text ? and thus he accounts for the polythe-

istic passages. Long after the termination of the Jewish state and indeed its partial restoration, Ezra produced a copy from memory, which is unlikely to have been trustworthy. That the Pentateuch is wrongly assigned to Moses and the Book of Joshua to Joshua is shown by the well known anachronisms.

The authorship of the Gospels is not disputed by him, though he considers the names of the authors no guarantee of the accuracy of their statements; a view which may be compared to that recently advanced by Dr. Drummond of the Johannine Gospel. John, our Arabic author informs us, was commonly believed to have translated Matthew's Gospel from Hebrew into Greek—a fact which makes the discrepancies between his Gospel and that which he translated all the more discreditable. All the Christian sects were agreed that Matthew's Gospel was written in Judaea nine years after the Ascension: that of Mark the Aaronite in Antioch twenty-eight years after the Ascension: that of Luke, like Mark a disciple of Peter (?), in Achaia, some time later; that of John in Athens more than sixty years after the Ascension. Of the Pauline writings he has a strange notion, which he ascribes to the Jews of his time. They asserted that Paul had been suborned by contemporary Jews to corrupt the newly founded Christian religion, by introducing the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. This story was taken quite seriously by Ibn Hazm, who observes that this malicious people had tried the same with Mohammedanism; a Jewish convert had introduced the doctrine of the divinity of Ali, which was held by a branch of the Shi'ites. In his attack on the Jewish religion our author vehemently upbraids the Rabbis for resorting to such tactics.

That the Jews and Christians had answers to all these objections cannot be doubted, and indeed their replies are

sometimes adduced. They were either identical with or similar to the answers to be found in apologetic works of our own day. The best answer was undoubtedly to retort with attacks on the Koran, which can easily be shown to contain the fellow to most of the objections which are brought against the two Testaments. Naturally Ibn Hazm on the defensive is a very different person from Ibn Hazm on the offensive, and resorts to a variety of evasions in the case of his own Sacred Book which he would by no means permit to be used in defence of the Sacred Books of others. The canon that the Koran being the composition of God must be made out to be worthy of its author is of course no better than the same canon when the Old or New Testament is substituted for the Koran ; and what has been gained by the application of rational criticism to one of these books is lost when the critic refuses to apply the same balance to the rest. Hence his work could only fan the flame of fanaticism in the communities with whose books it dealt, whereas the use of the even balance of science might have provided a basis of agreement for the more enlightened members of those communities.

One sect of Jews, of whom unfortunately little is known, appear to have drawn from the difficulties which all sacred books involve some better results than the determination to defend their own at all costs. The Jesuists, or followers of 'Isa, or Jesus, of Ispahan, appear to have assigned the three revelations co-ordinate value and to have regarded the communities founded by Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed as equally in the right. References to this interesting sect are exceedingly rare, though they are to be found outside the work of Ibn Hazm, who of course has to refute their creed as well as others. The same doctrine is said to be maintained still in the African state of Kong, probably without reference to the opinions of Jesus of Ispahan. Nor

is it known on what arguments this remarkable personage based an opinion which contained the remedy for so many ills. It appears, however, to have been an endeavour to compromise between the Jewish denial of Abrogation, against which Moslem theologians constantly argue, and the fact that the Jewish system showed no signs of spreading to any large portion of the human race.

If Ibn Hazm's work be collated with modern polemical treatises, such as W. Jekyll's *The Bible Untrustworthy* or the tract of St. Clair Tisdall mentioned above, one might fancy that time had stood still or at least marked no progress during 850 years; precisely the same objections are being urged against the Bible in 1905 as in 1050, and the same answers frequently given to those objections. But to the non-polemical treatises of our time this criticism does not apply. From the standpoint whence dogmas are treated not as corresponding with objective truth, but as phases of human or national development, the very passages which to an Ibn Hazm prove the spuriousness of the Bible become evidence of comparative genuineness. For they show that the new dogmas, even when enforced by fire and sword, were unable entirely to efface the older doctrines, the remains of which therefore are evidence of continuity of tradition from pre-historic into historic times. But the criticism which is able to employ such evidence must be conscious of the fact that an established religion is not the work of one person, but, like the Roman republic, the product of many ages and many men.

Of this system, according to which contradictions, inconsistencies, ethical and physical errors in the Sacred Texts are not scandals to be hushed up, but valuable fragments of history, it would be strange if we found any trace in a mediaeval writer. But the study of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures by a man who was freed from the notion

that their contents must be made at all costs to correspond with an *a priori* theory of the Word of God, could scarcely fail to lead him a few steps in the direction of modern criticism, and had not Ibn Hazm's purpose been achieved when he had discredited the Gospels, he might have produced some positive conclusions of interest some 800 years out of due time. Thus the criticism which has been quoted on the story of Peter and the keys shows that he had in his hand the premises for a fruitful investigation which only fanaticism prevented him from conducting. His notions of the origin of the Pentateuch also resemble the conclusions of the most modern criticism in some curious ways ; for he could not be expected to anticipate the theory that Ezra was a myth. The passage, therefore, about Ezra which, in Wellhausen's opinion, had been strangely neglected as late as 1880 had already received a due share of attention in the Moslem criticism of the Bible of the eleventh century. D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

NOTES ON RECENT NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

Two works in English, of different size and temper, have recently appeared upon the problem of Jesus Christ's life and teaching. The larger of these, *The Prophet of Nazareth* (1905), by Professor N. Schmidt, author of the scholarly articles on *The Son of Man* and *The Son of God* in the fourth volume of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, is a series of studies on the historical and dogmatic significance of the person of Christ. The book is not a unity, nor is there any attempt to grapple exhaustively with the problems of the gospel history. The fifth and sixth chapters do little more than condense the articles already referred to, and it is only the ninth, tenth and eleventh which form a continuous contribution to the subject of the volume's title. Dr. Schmidt's position on the historicity of the Gospels approximates to

that of Brandt in its radical character. Thus he refuses to allow that Jesus ever called himself "the Son of Man," or that he used or received the title "Son of God." "If He conceived of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man as universal, and avoided the temptation of assuming a special and unique relationship not attainable by others, it was because the genuineness of his experience and the righteousness of his moral disposition gave him a peculiarly clear vision of truth. So well did he realize his ideal of man as the child of the Father in heaven that men, fascinated by the spiritual beauty radiating from him, have gladly accorded him a title he never thought of claiming for himself, and have called him the Son of God" (pp. 156-157). In a misprinted note to p. 317 he criticizes Wellhausen for failing to do as much justice to the ethical ideas of Jesus as he does to the prophetic genius and religious teachings of the prophet of Nazareth. It is indeed upon the teaching, rather than on the history, of Jesus that Dr. Schmidt himself lays emphasis. Even in the story of the last days he is unable to admit that Jesus made a Messianic entry into Jerusalem. "The death on Calvary was not so tragic as such a surrender of his ideal would have been." Furthermore, owing to the legends which have gathered round Judas, "it is impossible to determine what part, if any, he had in helping the men to find Jesus. We have no reliable data from which to form a judgment of this man" (pp. 285-6). Dr. Schmidt also is unable to believe that Jesus ever celebrated the paschal meal, much less instituted the sacrament of the last supper, while the resurrection narratives, like the traditions of the Virgin-birth, are set aside as unhistorical.

Mr. T. A. Lacey's six popular lectures on *The Historic Christ* (1905, pp. 158) are a smaller, less detailed, and not

much more satisfactory volume by one who has caught something of Loisy's spirit. The first five lectures, a readable survey of the sources of the tradition, lay stress on Paul as a witness to the historic Jesus, partly because any deviation on his part from the primitive tradition would have been pounced upon by his opponents (pp. 41 f.). "There is no hint that anyone complained, for example, of his neglect of the Galilean life of Jesus, or disabled his gospel in consequence." Mr. Lacey, however, suggests that Paul's preaching of the Son of God tended "in practice to make for an imperfect apprehension of the real manhood of Jesus Christ" (pp. 60 f.), so that Peter's disciple, Mark, wrote his Gospel in order to bring out the real humanity of the Master. The whole synoptic tradition, in fact, was "in effect, if not in purpose, a necessary correction of a possible misunderstanding" due to an exaggeration of Paul's teaching in certain circles of the church. As for the Fourth Gospel, "you may say that whereas the other evangelists describe one scene of transfiguration, here we have a perpetual transfiguration, but the cloud is always at hand to dim the eyes of the beholder" (p. 72), the Divine Master being perpetually misunderstood. The dogmatic deductions are that the Johannine conception of Christ is equivalent to the Pauline, the Pauline to the primitive, and that the primitive is no other than that of Chalcedon. Unlike Loisy, Mr. Lacey adheres stoutly to the theory of an eye-witness behind the Fourth Gospel, whose historical value he upholds as against any symbolical evaporation.

The attempts made by several scholars recently, especially by Wendland (*Hermes*, 1898, pp. 175-179), H. Reich (*Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1894, pp. 705-33), and Vollmer (*Jesus u. das Sacäenopfer*, 1905), to trace the story of the

mocking of Jesus in the praetorium back to some pagan festival or tradition like that of the Sacaea, are discussed adversely in a recent number of *Hermes* (1906, pp. 220 f.) by Dr. J. Geffcken, who argues that the Saturnalian king has very few points of resemblance to the pseudo-king of the Jews. The possibility that Roman soldiers, even though they had served in the East, could have confounded the Sacaeian festival with their mockery of Jesus is denied outright. The Roman conscience was entirely opposed to human sacrifices in any case; even those of the Druids or of Saturnus were prohibited. And the *Acta of Dasius*, to which Wendland appeals for confirmation of the Saturnalia theory, are pronounced too untrustworthy to form a reliable piece of evidence. Nor does the well known scene, in which the Alexandrian populace ridiculed the Jewish Agrippa (Philo, *in Flacc.* 5-6), show that the gospel narrative is based on the conception of Jesus as a king of the mime. The Alexandrian mockery was levelled at Agrippa, not as a Jew, but as a king, and the Roman soldiers at Jerusalem can hardly have assimilated their treatment of Jesus to what they suddenly remembered of the mime-king of Alexandria. While refusing to accept such explanations of the tradition, Dr. Geffcken closes by admitting that the mockery of Jesus appears to him an elaboration and reiteration of certain elements in the previous scene of rejection before the Sanhedrim (Matt. xxvi. 68, Mark xiv. 65=Luke xxii. 64), the one representing the rejection of his prophetic, the other of his kingly rôle. If, as Brandt argues (*die evangelische Geschichte*, pp. 69 f.), the rejection before the council is partly to be explained as an elaboration of certain old Testament conceptions, the historicity of the subsequent mockery would lose some of its foundation also.

It is several years since Mr. Montefiore published his

study of Paul's Epistles in relation to Rabbinic Judaism. A similar appreciation, at once less acute and less sympathetic, is printed by Dr. Köhler, of Chicago, in the eleventh volume of the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (1905, pp. 79-87), who traces back the Apostle's teaching, not to Rabbinic Judaism but to Alexandrian Hellenism. The critical basis of the article is most unsatisfactory. The Acts of Paul and Thecla are pronounced in some respects "of greater historic value than the canonical Acts of the Apostles"; Galatians ii.-iii. is dismissed as unreliable, as indeed are most passages of the Epistles or of Acts whenever they happen to contradict the author's preconceived ideas; and passages like 1 Thessalonians ii. 14b-16, 1 Corinthians xv. 56, and 2 Corinthians iii. 6, iv. 4 are arbitrarily set aside as interpolations. Dr. Köhler goes as far as he can with van Manen, stopping only when he feels that such hypercriticism would logically remove any figure of Paul from the range of such extraordinary charges as (i.) that the Apostle "substituted for the natural, childlike faith of man in God as the ever-present Helper in all trouble, a blind, artificial faith prescribed and imposed from without, and which is accounted as a meritorious act"; that (ii.) his doctrine of sin "robbed human life of its healthy impulses, the human soul of its faith in its own regenerating powers, of its belief in its own self and in its inherent tendencies to goodness"; (iii.) that in preferring faith and vision to reason and common sense "he opened wide the door to all kinds of mysticism and superstition"; and (iv.) that Paul's venomous hatred of the Jews was stronger and more characteristic than his panegyric on love in 1 Corinthians xiii.

In the latest number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, Herr. G. Kittel (pp. 419-36), after an exegetical study of the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Paul's Epistles, concludes in favour

of the subjective sense of the question, following Haussleiter's lead in his *Der Glaube Jesu Christi u. der christliche Glaube, ein Beitrag zur Erklärung d. Römerbriefs* (1881). Professor S. McComb again has just defined Paul's characteristic view of faith as that "by which we assimilate and consummate Christ's redemptive work" (*Biblical World*, 1905, 292-99). Its essence is "absolute trust in, enthusiastic loyalty and devotion of heart to, Jesus as the Messiah and Son of God." Thus Paul's view of faith is formally different from the view of Jesus, who made faith simply "trust in God's fatherly goodness, whereby a man rises above all outward and inward impediments and achieves dominion over the forces of evil" (Matt. xvii. 20; Mark ix. 23; Luke xvii. 6). Paul identifies the object of faith with its organ. But in so doing he stands remote from the ecclesiastical notion: "submission of the intellect to authority ruins the very nerve of Paul's teaching, which in its highest form always emphasizes passionate self-surrender to a person." In this way, and in this way alone, the ethical interests of religion are conserved. "Faith is neither a substitute for conduct, nor an arbitrary condition of Christian living, but simply the latent instinct of sonship, awakened by Christ to self-consciousness."

JAMES MOFFATT.

INDEX.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Rev. Professor Vernon Bartlet, D.D. | PAGE |
| Melito the Author of the Muratorian Canon | 210 |
| Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, D.D. | |
| The Holiness of God, and of the Godly. | 531 |
| Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, D.D., Litt.D. | |
| The Life of Christ according to St. Mark | 56, 340, 545 |
| Rev. Professor Hugh Black, M.A. | |
| Personal Religious Influence | 254 |
| Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A. | |
| St. Paul's Rule of Life | 111 |
| Stanley A. Cook, M.A. | |
| Old Testament Notes | 186, 476 |
| Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D., Litt.D. | |
| St. Peter : Correspondences between his History and his Teaching | 289 |
| Rev. H. T. F. Duckworth, D.D., Toronto. | |
| The Origin of the Book of Daniel | 224 |
| Rev. Professor A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D. | |
| Studies in the "Inner Life" of Jesus : | |
| XVI. The Foreshadowing of the Cross | 410 |
| XVII. The Foregleams of the Glory | 518 |
| Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D. | |
| The Alphabetic Structure of Psalms ix. and x. . . . | 233 |
| Rev. H. G. Grey, M.A. | |
| A Suggestion on St. John xix. 14 | 451 |

Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D.

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Cretans Always Liars. | 305 |
| The Use of Testimonies in the Early Christian Church | 385 |
| The Pool of Bethesda | 508 |

J. H. A. Hart, M.A.

| | |
|--|----|
| The Scribes of the Nazarenes | 64 |
|--|----|

Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Statistics of Sabbath Keeping in Babylonia. | 433 |
|---|-----|

Professor William Knight, LL.D.

| | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| The Site of Capernaum | 48 |
|---------------------------------|----|

Rev. Professor Robert Mackintosh, D.D.

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Antichrist of 2 Thessalonians | 427 |
|---|-----|

Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A., Litt.D.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Dr. Orr on the Problem of the Old Testament | 19 |
| Biblical Criticism in the Eleventh Century | 553 |

Rev. D. M. McIntyre, M.A.

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Mystical Doctrine of Christ | 161 |
|---|-----|

Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.

| | |
|--|---------|
| Notes on Recent New Testament Study. | 89, 563 |
|--|---------|

Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., Litt.D.

Synoptic Studies:

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| I. The Beatitudes | 97 |
|-----------------------------|----|

Professor Sir William Ramsay, D.C.L., D.D.

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Tarsus | 29, 135, 268, 365 |
| The Permanence of Religion at Holy Places in the East | 454 |
| Professor Harnack on Luke | 481 |

Rev. Professor G. A. Smith, D.D., LL.D.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ezra and Nehemiah | 1 |
| Nehemiah's Jerusalem | 121 |
| The Jewish Constitution from Nehemiah to the Maccabees | 193 |
| The Jewish Constitution from the Maccabees to the End | 348 |

INDEX OF TEXTS

571

PAGE

Rev. Professor James Stalker, D.D.

What is "the Communion of the Holy Ghost"? . . . 264

Principal W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

The Doctrine of the Church in the Epistle to the
Ephesians 318

Rev. F. W. Orde Ward, B.A.

The Stature of Christ 441

Rev. Newport J. D. White, D.D.

The Unchangeableness of Jesus Christ in Relation to
Christian Doctrine 175

INDEX OF TEXTS.

| | PAGE | | PAGE | | PAGE |
|----------------------------|--------|------------------------|------|-----------------------|------|
| Gen. v. 24 . . . | 520 | Ps. ix. | 233 | Mark iii. 28-30 . . . | 81 |
| Exod. xvi. 22 . . . | 199 | x. | 233 | vi. 53 | 49 |
| xix. 6 | 557 | xvi. | 519 | viii. 17, 21 . . . | 56 |
| xx. 8 | 556 | xxxvii. 11 . . . | 103 | 31 | 88 |
| xxiv. 1 | 202 | cxlviii. 7 . . . | 134 | x. 1 | 71 |
| xxix. 6 | 199 | Prov. xi. 30 . . . | 106 | 11 | 90 |
| Lev. xi. 44 . . . | 540 | Isa. viii. 14 . . . | 407 | xi. 12 | 64 |
| Num. viii. 14-17 . . . | 535 | xi. 4 | 430 | xiv. 17-21 . . . | 56 |
| xi. 16 | 200 | xxxv. 4 | 395 | 22-25. | 57 |
| xiv. 20. | 189 | liii. 4 | 396 | 26-31 | 59 |
| xvi. 2 | 202 | 9 | 100 | 32-41 | 60 |
| Joshua xi. 6 . . . | 189 | lxi. 2 | 102 | 42-52 | 62 |
| 1 Kings xi. 34 . . . | 200 | xi. 19. | 400 | 53-64 | 340 |
| 2 Kings viii. 20, 22 . . . | 191 | Ezek. xiv. 13- 4 . . . | 232 | 54 | 345 |
| 2 Chron. xix. 8-11 . . . | 200 | Matt. i. 42 | 299 | 66-72 | 345 |
| xxiv. 19-25 . . . | 89 | iv. 11-15 | 85 | xv. 1-15 | 545 |
| Ezra i. 2-4 | 3 | v. 11, 12 | 101 | 16-20 | 550 |
| vii. 8 | 14 | 21 | 358 | 21-27 | 551 |
| vii. 27-ix. | 4 | v. 39 | 87 | xvi 1-2 | 89 |
| viii. 21, 23 . . . | 129 | viii. 5 | 49 | Luke i. 53 | 103 |
| ix. 6-15 | 6 | ix. 15 | 412 | iv. 13-26 | 85 |
| x. 9 | 2 | x. 23 | 67 | v. 34, 35 | 412 |
| 14 | 197 | xi. 29 | 103 | vi. 20-26 | 98 |
| 16 | 9 | xii. 31 | 81 | vii. 22 | 68 |
| Neh. i. 3 | 14 | xv. 1 | 359 | x. 4 | 87 |
| ii. 1 | 9 | xvi. 23 | 294 | xi. 14 | 82 |
| 8, 9 | 121 | xvii. 2, 3 | 522 | xii. 10 | 81 |
| iv. 15 | 2 | 9 | 525 | 21 | 100 |
| v. 17 | 2, 196 | xviii. 10 | 105 | xiii. 33 | 360 |
| vi. 18 | 125 | 21 | 294 | xv. 18, 21 . . . | 101 |
| vii. 4 | 11 | xix. 9 | 71 | xvi. 22 | 519 |
| 5 | 196 | xxii. 40 | 226 | xxii. 5, 8 | 452 |
| viii. 9 | 10 | xxiii. 35 | 89 | 24-34 | 295 |
| ix. 6-37 | 6 | xxviii. 1 | 89 | xxiv. 44 | 226 |
| xiii. 4-9. | 125 | Mark ii. 19, 20 . . . | 412 | John i. 42. . . . | 290 |

| | PAGE | | PAGE | | PAGE |
|-------------------|------|--------------------------|---------|---------------------------|------|
| John ii. 12 . . . | 85 | Acts xix. 9-20 . . . | 93 | Gal. i. 21 . . . | 495 |
| 19 . . . | 411 | 35 . . . | 31 | ii. 1-11 . . . | 502 |
| vi. 17 . . . | 51 | xxi. 39 . . . | 39, 268 | 11-14 . . . | 299 |
| 51 . . . | 413 | xxvi. 23 . . . | 65, 408 | 20 . . . | 114 |
| vii. 1-8 . . . | 83 | xxviii. 4 . . . | 489 | vi. 15 . . . | 70 |
| x. 11 . . . | 424 | 17-31 . . . | 499 | Col. i. 18, 24 . . . | 318 |
| 16 . . . | 324 | Rom. i. 14 . . . | 283 | ii. 8 . . . | 93 |
| 34 . . . | 226 | 19 . . . | 375 | 15 . . . | 369 |
| xiii. 2 . . . | 451 | ii. 14 . . . | 375 | iv. 5 . . . | 288 |
| 14, 15 . . . | 300 | ix. 3 . . . | 40 | 1 Thess. ii. 14-16 . . . | 437 |
| xvi. 20 . . . | 101 | xii. 3-5 . . . | 320 | iv. 15 . . . | 90 |
| xviii. 28 . . . | 452 | xiii. 8 . . . | 283 | 2 Thess. ii. 3 . . . | 428 |
| xix. 14 . . . | 451 | xv. 26 . . . | 265 | ix. 2 . . . | 91 |
| xx. 30 . . . | 65 | 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11 . . . | 90 | 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4 . . . | 368 |
| Acts i. 22 . . . | 67 | 29, 31 . . . | 70 | 5 . . . | 286 |
| ii. 22 . . . | 117 | ix. 24-27 . . . | 285 | 8 . . . | 184 |
| iv. 11, 12 . . . | 299 | xi. 6 . . . | 278 | iv. 7, 8 . . . | 284 |
| viii. 34 . . . | 66 | xvi. 3 . . . | 266 | Heb. ii. 9 . . . | 528 |
| ix. 1 . . . | 358 | 2 Cor. iii. 12 . . . | 73 | xiii. 8, 9 . . . | 175 |
| 31 . . . | 368 | v. 14 . . . | 111 | 2 Pet. ii. 1-iii. 2 . . . | 94 |
| x. 38 . . . | 117 | viii. 3, 4 . . . | 265 | iii. 1-16 . . . | 95 |
| xiv. 19 . . . | 496 | ix. 13 . . . | 265 | Rev. ii. 10 . . . | 286 |
| xvii. 18 . . . | 310 | Gal. i. 11-17 . . . | 113 | xiii. 18 . . . | 96 |



